

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLII, 4.

WHOLE No. 168.

I.—WORD-ENDS AND PAUSES IN THE HEXAMETER.

In an important article in *AJP.* XL, pp. 343-372, Professor Bassett has discussed the doctrine of caesura among the ancients. He shows that our traditional view of the matter rests upon a combination of several originally distinct theories. Professor Bassett discusses three of these, which he denominates the metric theory, the rhythmic theory, and the rhetorical theory. At first the metric theory had two forms, which it will be convenient to separate.

(1) Some metrician observed that the hexameter contains several shorter dactylic measures, namely, the trimeter catalectic ($\underline{\text{v v}} \underline{\text{v v}}$) and acatalectic ($\text{v v} \underline{\text{v v}}$) and the tetrameter catalectic ($\underline{\text{v v}} \underline{\text{v v}} \underline{\text{v v}}$) and acatalectic ($\text{v v} \underline{\text{v v}} \underline{\text{v v}}$), and that one or more such verses can be taken out of almost any one of Homer's lines, for the reason that the close of one or more of these shorter units usually coincides with the end of a word. The term *τομή* (Latin *caesura*) was originally applied to the shorter metric unit contained within the hexameter, but it was afterwards used of the close of that unit.

(2) Varro observed that the fifth half-foot always (*omnimo*) closed a word, and we are told that certain unnamed metricians held that only the first two and the last two feet of the hexameter might consist of single whole words. The theory has been modified and interpreted by modern scholars as follows (to abridge Professor Bassett's statement, pp. 370 ff.). Since the hexameter has a somewhat rigid metrical scheme, the poets were at considerable pains to avoid monotony of rhythm. Among the devices employed was such an arrangement of words that

the pauses at the ends of the words should not accentuate the metrical divisions. It was not possible to avoid altogether the coincidence of a word-end with the close of a foot, and scarcely desirable, since variety was the great need of the hexameter; but such coincidence was rather carefully avoided at the middle of the verse to prevent the line from breaking apart into two trimeters. This latter point, I may add, has been emphasized by some scholars; Monro, for example, in the introduction to his edition of the *Iliad* (p. lxxiv), states, as one of the two chief rules of the Homeric hexameter, that "the third foot must not end a word."

(3) Students of rhythmic structure seem to have held that each hexameter contained two *cola* (Bassett, p. 355).

(4) The rhetoricians observed that the rhetorical units combine with the metrical units in various ways. They sometimes correspond with the verse, sometimes they are longer, sometimes they are shorter, and sometimes there are several of them in a single verse. The poets were careful to secure variety by placing the rhetorical pauses at different points. Our clearest authority for this theory before its contamination with other theories is Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *De Comp. Verb.* 26.

The combinations of these theories have been numerous and confusing both in ancient and in modern times. Clear thinking requires their rigid separation. The first and third of them may be very briefly dismissed. The observation that the dactylic hexameter contains certain shorter measures is undoubtedly true, but it is scarcely significant. The doctrine that the hexameter consists of two rhythmic *cola*, on the other hand, is not supported by any noteworthy evidence (Bassett, p. 370). The other two theories require further discussion.

I.

The theory that the coincidence of word-ends with the divisions between feet tended to break the verse into its elements, involves the assumption that the ends of the words were marked by a slight pause. This assumption is sometimes explicitly made,¹ and it is logically necessary for all who hold that word-

¹ For example, Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 338; Lindsay, *The Captivi of Plautus*, p. 69.

ends, as such, have significance in the composition of verse. But in modern languages there are no pauses between words within the phrase, or, to be more exact, within the breath-group.² It is unlikely that Greek and Latin differed from the modern languages in this respect; and we have besides abundant evidence that they did not have pauses within the breath-groups.

A phrase cannot be fused into a compound word unless it is pronounced as one word, and no one will care to assume a pause within a word. Consequently the verbal phrases, which were in Homeric times just giving rise to the compound verbs of later Greek, must have been pronounced without a pause after the prefix when this immediately preceded the verb. The same argument applies to all other stereotyped phrases during the period of their development. Examples are Διόσκουροι, δουρίκτητος, ἔαντόν, ἐκποδών, καρηκομώντες, Κυνόσουρα, νέωσοικοι, παλαιόφατος, πανῆμαρ, Πελοπόννησος, τρεισκαίδεκα. Particularly important are stereotyped phrases which involve crasis, as γάρ, έάν, καλὸς κάγαθός, οὐδείς, ταῦτα. Significant also are the derivatives of phrases, such as ἀγχωμαχήτης, Αἴγοσποταμίτης, αἰειγενέτης, Διοσκουρίτης, ἐκκαιδέκατος, ἐμπυριβήτης, ἐπαίτιος, θεοισεχθρία, νουνεχόντως, πεντεκαιδεκάποδες (*IG. II Add. 834 b II 20*).

The assimilation of final to initial consonants and other changes of final consonants under the influence of following initials may be understood only if there is no pause between the words. Such is the source of the variants *eis* and *es*, *ēξ* and *ēκ*, *oὐk* and *oὐχ*. Inscriptions and papyri have countless instances of the assimilation of a final consonant of the article and of certain prepositions, and occasionally of other words. The following are merely illustrative: ἐὰμ βούληται *P. Rev. L. 41. 17*, ἐγ¹ Δίνδον *IG. I 259. 9*, ἐχ¹ θετῶν *I 31 B 9*, *hèk ποδῶν I 322 a 67*, ἐγγ¹ δακτύλων, *II Add. 834 b II 11*, ἐμ¹ Πηλονοσίω *P. Rev. L. 52. 18*, ἐπάγ¹ γάρ *P. Eud. 15. 8*, *hieρōγχ χρεμάτῶν IG. I 188. 2*, κατ' ἀλήθεαμ¹ πλημμελονμένοις *P. Par. 63. 13. 10*, *Κροκοδίλωμ πόλει P. Petr.*²

¹ German is no exception to the rule, although elementary teachers of that language sometimes contrast it with French and English in precisely this respect. Such a phrase as *Guten Abend* does indeed separate the final consonant of the first word from the first vowel of the second; but the separation is due solely to the unwritten initial consonant (the glottal plosive) of all German words whose first written letter is a vowel.

21 (a) 2. 7, μὲμ φονχάς *IG.* I 442. 5, νῦμ μέν I Suppl. a 27 a 48, ὅταμ πέμπη II 86. 24, οὐθὲμ πῆμα *P. Par.* 2. 3. 9, οὐμ ποίσεις *P. Petr.* II 19 (2) 2, πλὴγ γῆς *IG.* I Suppl. a 61 a 16, τὲμ πόλιν I 55 c 3, τὸγ κήρυκα II 61. 9, τὸμ παῖδα *P. Petr.* I 14. 17, δγ χρή I (1B) 26.

It is well known that the phonetically imperceptible word-division after the English indefinite article has led to incorrect divisions such as *an adder* (German *Natter*), and *a nickname* (properly *eke-name*). Similar to these forms are οὐνεκα from such phrases as ἐκείνονεκα, ἄττα from ὅτοιά ττα, etc., and Modern Greek τὸ νῶμον from τὸν ώμον.

The clearest evidence of all is furnished by the phenomena of crasis, elision, and semi-elision. Since all of these occur in verse and the last-mentioned two are particularly common in heroic verse, they prove that there need be no pauses at word-ends in the dactylic hexameter. Scarcely less important is the treatment of final syllables with short vowels. Such a word as πόλιν has a long final syllable if the next word begins with a consonant; and even such a word as τά is long if the next word begins with two consonants.

The evidence for Latin is similar. A number of the stereotyped phrases have been discussed by Sturtevant and Kent, *TAPA*. XLVI pp. 129 ff. Others are *adhuc*, *admodum*, *antequam*, *comminus*, *denuo*, *dummodo*, *duodecim*, *duodeviginti*, *etiam*, *interea*, *necnon*, *nequis*, *nescio*, *nonnulli*, *numquis*, *obviam*, *posthac*, *postquam*, *priusquam*, *proconsule*, *propterea*, *prospere*, *quamvis*, *quasi*, *quilibet*, *quomodo*, *quoniam*, *sacrosanus*, *sedulo*, *siquidem*, *siquis*, *triumvir*. There are a few derivatives of phrases, such as *abecedarius*, *antelucanus*, *antemeridianus*, *duodecimus*, *duodevicesimus*, *interregnus*, *interrex*, *obvius*, *proconsularis*, *profanus*, *prosperus*, *triumviratus*.

That several of the above phrases were pronounced under a single main accent, is shown by phonetic changes of the unaccented syllables (*comminus*, *denuo*, *sedulo*). The accentuation of many phrases, including several already mentioned, is shown by the incidence of the ictus in Plautus and Terence; e. g., *intér se*, *intér vos*, *apúd me*, *proptér me*, *malám rem* (see Lindsay, *Latin Language*, pp. 168 ff., *The Captivi of Plautus*, pp. 357 ff.).

Cogent evidence is afforded by the iambic shortening of initial syllables after short final syllables, e. g., *quís hūc*, *út hač*, *quíd ēxprobras*, *úb(i) accubēs*.

The phenomena of syncope of final vowels within a phrase (*ac*, *nec*, *dein*), of aphaeresis (*amatu's*, *amatust*, *amatumst*), of elision and semi-elision³ constitute the clearest proof that there was no pause within a breath-group in Latin.

Yet the word-ends are very unevenly distributed in the hexameter, and some explanation must be substituted for the old one, if that is to be rejected. Table I below shows the frequency of word-ends in the sixteen possible positions in the first 500 lines of the *Iliad* and of the *Aeneid*. The figures in the top line indicate the six feet, and the letters in the next line indicate the three possible positions of a word-end in each foot (*a* — after the first syllable, *b* — after the first short syllable, *c* — the end of the foot). In making the count the word-division commonly denoted in printed texts has been followed, except that Greek enclitics have been reckoned as parts of the words to which they are appended.

A glance at the table shows that current theory is out of harmony with the facts. Monro's rule, quoted above, that the third foot must not end with a word is violated by 21.6 per cent of the Homeric verses studied and by 15.6 per cent of the Vergilian. In fact one should not speak of an avoidance of word-ends at the end of any foot in the *Iliad*. It is true that coincidence between the end of words and of feet is somewhat less common in the *Aeneid* in the second, third, and fourth feet; perhaps it is no accident that all evidence more ancient than Eustathius for the avoidance of such coincidence is Roman.⁴ Nevertheless, even in Vergil words end at *2b* and *3b* less often than at *2c* and *3c*, while words end at *4b* less than one thirteenth as often as at *4c*; no explanation of the position of word-ends in Vergil can be satisfactory if it neglects these facts.

The differences between the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* are more

³ See especially Sommer, *Handbuch der lat. Laut- und Formenlehre*, pp. 290 ff., and Sturtevant and Kent, *op. cit.*

⁴ See Bassett, *op. cit.*, p. 368, who, however, feels certain that the παλαιοι, whom Eustathius cites, were Greeks. Is it certain that they did not use Roman sources?

TABLE I.

POSITION OF WORD-ENDS IN THE FIRST 500 VERSES OF
ILIAD AND AENEID.

Feet	1			2			3		
	a	b	c	a	b	c	a	b	c
Place in Foot									
% of Vss.									
of Iliad.	35.5	31.4	41.0	60.6	16.4	22.4	44.6	60.6	21.6
% of Vss.									
of Aeneid.	34.0	16.2	44.6	64.0	16.8	17.0	84.6	11.0	15.6
Feet				4			5		
Place in Foot	a	b	c	a	b	c	a		
% of Vss.									
of Iliad.	47.4	2.2	62.4	24.4	49.8	24.8			1.2
% of Vss.									
of Aeneid.	78.2	3.8	52.4	2.0	46.6	60.4			1.8

numerous and striking than their points of resemblance. The percentages are nearly alike at 1a, 1c, 2a, 2b, 4b, 5b, and 6a, while they differ, in some cases very much indeed, in the nine other positions. The differences are most numerous and extensive in the third and fourth feet—the feet which students of caesura consider most important. Probably, therefore, the position of the word-ends in the verse is a function not so much of the verse, which is the same in both poems, as of the language, in which the two poems differ.

At any rate we must study the two sets of figures separately. Since the second one presents the greater number of characteristic features, we have a better chance of finding a satisfactory explanation of it, and consequently we shall start with that.

As to the first four feet of the *Aeneid*, the prominent features are the frequency of word-ends at 2a, 3a, and 4a, and their rarity at 3b and 4b. In the last two feet the relative frequencies are reversed; word-ends are extremely rare at 5a and 6a, but common at 5b.

All of these facts are easily explained by the effort which the Roman dactylic poets made to secure coincidence of accent and ictus in the last two feet and clash of accent and ictus in the first four feet (as I have shown in *CP. XIV*, pp. 373-385). For a word-end at a requires clash of accent and ictus, unless it is preceded by an accented monosyllable, and these are very rare

in Latin. Since most Latin words are dissyllables or trisyllables, the placing of word-ends at *a*, as in the first four feet, involves the rarity of word-ends at *b* and *c* in the same and the neighboring feet, while the avoidance of word-ends at *a*, as in the last two feet, leaves many word-ends for *b* and *c*. The frequency of word-ends at 4*c* is therefore due in part to the avoidance of them at 5*a*, where they would cause clash of accent and ictus in the fifth foot, and in part to the avoidance of word-ends at 4*b*, where they would cause harmony of accent and ictus in the fourth foot.

There are, of course, other factors in the problem. The comparative rarity of word-ends at *b* in all feet except the fifth is in part due to the fact that words cannot end at *b* if the foot is a spondee. In the fifth foot word-ends are somewhat rarer at *b* than at *c* for two reasons. (1) A word-end at 5*b* must be followed either by a short monosyllable or by a word of the rhythm $\text{v} \text{--}$ (monosyllabic verse-finals are so rare that they need not be taken into account). Both kinds of words are rare in Latin. Monosyllables constitute only about 19 per cent of Vergil's words, and a very large majority of Latin monosyllables are long; while trisyllables with iambic beginning constitute only about 6 per cent of Vergil's words.⁵ It is interesting to note that Vergil favored the latter verse-final as much as his resources allowed; in the last two feet words of this rhythm constitute 18 per cent of all words. (2) The only words that can end at *b* are short monosyllables (whose rarity has just been noted), and polysyllables ending in a trochee. I have no statistics as to the frequency of words with this cadence in Vergil's vocabulary; but our table shows that such words are uncommon in the interior of the verse (they are possible only if they end at *b*), and a glance at the text will show that they are in a minority at the end of the verse, if one excludes words with a short vowel before a single consonant, which would usually "make position" in the interior of the verse.

The position of word-ends in Homer cannot be explained with such completeness; but there is less to explain, since the extreme variation is far less. This fact indicates that Homeric usage

⁵ See *CP.* XIV, pp. 375-378.

is not controlled by any one factor of such strength as the Latin stress accent.

There remain such factors as had a minor effect upon the position of word-ends in Vergil. The fact that words cannot end at *b* when the foot is a spondee explains the comparative rarity of word-ends at 1*b* and 2*b*, and does a little toward explaining the almost total absence of word-ends at 4*b*. It seems likely that the length and rhythmic character of the available words was of prime importance in fixing the position of the word-ends in Homer. The matter is so complicated that it can be satisfactorily studied only at the ends of the verse. Since the first foot presents merely an average number of word-ends in each of the three places, with the anticipated reduction in the second, we shall make our investigation at the other end of the verse.

We should expect each type of word which is possible at the end of the line to appear there with the same relative frequency as in the verse as a whole. In Table II the first column exhibits the various types of words which are possible at the end of the verse, and the second column records the proportion of words of each type in 3500 words of *Iliad I* and *II*.⁶ But before we base a prediction upon these numbers, we must make three corrections. There is a pause in the sense at the close of at least two thirds of Homer's lines, and no line is closed by a word which stands in unusually close syntactic relation to what follows, such as *kai*, prepositions, the article, and relative pronouns and adverbs. Now these words which cannot stand at the end of a line are nearly all monosyllables and dissyllables, and furthermore there are many other monosyllables and dissyllables which usually stand at or near the beginning of a sentence or clause, and so can but rarely stand at the end of a line. The poet, then, will be found to use fewer monosyllables and dissyllables at the end of the line than the numbers in Column II suggest.

⁶In compiling these statistics I have reckoned enclitics with the words to which they are appended ('Ατρεΐδης τε = _ u u _ u), and I have counted elided syllables (*μνηλ'* = _ u u, δ' = u), but I have recorded words with synizesis in the form which they show in the verse (Πηληιάδεω = _ _ u u _).

TABLE II.
VERSE-FINALS IN THE ILIAD.

I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	Actual proportion in lines studied
Possible words that may end verse.	Proportion in verse as a whole	Less words unlikely as verse-finals	Proportion to 37.35	With correction for spondaic verses	With correction for rhythmic character of preceding words		
c c - - - c	20.11	.68	1.82	1.82	.98	.9	
c - - - - c	22.29	14.00	37.48	37.48	26.50	26.2	
c - - - - -	8.29	8.29	22.20	29.08	30.62	43.0	
c - - - - -	4.69	4.69	12.56	3.27	1.76	.9	
c - - - - -	5.66	5.66	15.15	19.85	26.29	16.4	
- - - - c	1.46	1.46	3.91	1.02	.72	3.4	
- - - - c	1.97	1.97	5.27	6.90	12.44	8.7	
c - - - - c	.43	.43	1.15	.30	.31	.1	
v v - - - c	.11	.11	.29	.08	.10	.2	
- - v v - c	.03	.03	.08	.10	.13	.1	
c v - v v - c	.03	.03	.08	.10	.13	.1	
	37.35						

In order to determine the amount of the necessary correction, I have counted the parts of speech at the ends of 1000 lines. I find that 94.5 per cent of the line-finals are either nouns, verbs or adjectives; adverbs and pronouns are so rare that they may safely be neglected. Now 3.4 per cent of Homer's monosyllables and 62.8 per cent of his dissyllables with long initial syllable are verbs, nouns, or adjectives. In Column III, therefore, we substitute for the first two numbers of Column II respectively 3.4 and 62.8 per cent of those numbers.

Since the total of the percentages in Column III is only 37.35, we must reduce them to a denominator of 100 for purposes of comparison. This is done in Column IV.

Some types of words are possible verse-finals only if the fifth foot is a dactyl, and others only if the fifth foot is a spondee. Since Homer favored the dactyl in the fifth foot, we shall expect to find more of the words which require a dactyl than the numbers in Column IV indicate, and fewer of the words which require a spondee. Since spondaic verses occur at the rate of

about 4.6 per 100, we must distribute 4.6 among the word-types which require spondaic verses in proportion to the frequency of these word-types. It was never necessary for the poet to place a fifth spondee before a verse-final of the rhythm $\bar{\bar} \text{ } \bar{\bar}$ or $\bar{\bar} \text{ } - \bar{\bar}$, and, as a matter of fact, he very rarely did so. We may therefore assign all of the 4.6 to the rhythmic types $\bar{\bar} \text{ } \bar{\bar}$, $\bar{\bar} \text{ } - \bar{\bar}$, $\bar{\bar} \text{ } - \bar{\bar} \text{ } \bar{\bar}$, and $\bar{\bar} \text{ } - \bar{\bar} \text{ } \bar{\bar}$ ($\bar{\bar} \text{ } - \bar{\bar} \text{ } \bar{\bar}$, $\bar{\bar} \text{ } - \bar{\bar} \text{ } \bar{\bar}$, etc. do not occur in the lines studied). Since words of these types aggregate 17.91 per cent of Homeric words capable of standing at the end of a line, we must multiply the number which stands in Column IV opposite each of them by $\frac{4.6}{17.91} = .26$.

The remainder of the 17.91 per cent, which Column IV assigned to the verse-finals requiring spondaic lines, must be distributed among the rhythmic types which require a dactyl in the fifth foot, in proportion to the frequency of these several types. That is, we must add to each number in Column IV opposite $\text{u} - \bar{\text{u}}$, $\text{u} \text{ u} - \bar{\text{u}}$, $\text{-} \text{u} \text{ u} - \bar{\text{u}}$, $\text{-} \text{-} \text{u} \text{ u} - \bar{\text{u}}$, or $\text{u} \text{ u} - \text{u} \text{ u} - \bar{\text{u}}$, an amount equal to the same number times $\frac{17.91 - 4.6}{42.78} = .31$. The results of these operations appear in Column V.

Again, the choice of the final word of the line must have depended in part upon the ease with which another word could be fitted in before it. Table III⁷ exhibits the proportion of Homer's words of each of the rhythmic types possible before each of the possible types of verse-finals. Each block is headed by an indication of the rhythmic type or types of verse-finals treated therein. The first columns of the several blocks list the rhythmic types which can stand before such verse-finals. The second columns show what proportion of all Homeric words belong to the several rhythmic types of the first columns. The third columns show what proportion the numbers in the second columns constitute of the totals of the second columns.

The totals of the second columns indicate the proportion of Homeric words which can stand before the several types of

⁷In making this computation I have reckoned words at the end of the line in their normal rhythmic form ($\kappa\acute{\nu}\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\nu = \text{υ}_-\text{υ}$, $\beta\omega\lambda\eta = -\text{υ}$, $\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota = \text{υ}_-$, $\delta\pi\alpha\nu\alpha = \text{υ}_-\text{υ}$), while other words have been counted in the rhythmic value which they have in each occurrence ($\mu\nu\rho\acute{\iota} = -\text{υ}$, $\tau\grave{\alpha}$ before $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha = -$, $\tau\acute{\iota}s\ \tau\acute{\iota} = -$, $\chi\rho\acute{\beta}\sigma\epsilon\omega$ in line 15 = $-\text{υ}$). Consequently elided monosyllables have not been counted at all.

TABLE III.
RHYTHMIC TYPES POSSIBLE BEFORE THE POSSIBLE VERSE-FINALS.

verse-finals. Evidently the most difficult types of verse-finals to manage are - \bar{v} and - - - \bar{v} (with the assumption, of course, that they are to be preceded by dactyls). Now, more than half (15.3 out of 30.3) of the words which are possible before \bar{v} and - - \bar{v} are long monosyllables; and before these the same difficulty would arise as before - \bar{v} and - - - \bar{v} . We must therefore substitute for the total in the first block 30.3 — 15.3 + (15.3 \times .229) = 17.41. This is done in the last line of Table III.

We now multiply the numbers in Table II, Column V, by the numbers in the last line of Table III, and reduce the results to decimals of their sum. These are the numbers which appear in Table II, Column VI, which may therefore be considered as a prediction of the relative frequency of the several types of verse-finals.

In Column VII of Table II we have their actual proportions in 1000 lines of the *Iliad*. In spite of several striking divergencies, the two columns correspond in several important respects. The types of first, second, third, and fourth frequency are the same in both, and, in both, the four types at the bottom of the table are much less frequent than any others. These correspondencies are enough to show that the rhythmic character of the available words did, in the main, determine the character of the verse-finals.

The divergencies between the two columns are in part due to properties of the rhythmic types which we have not succeeded in measuring. For example, rhythmic types which were convenient at the end of the verse were convenient also in other positions, and so there arose a certain rivalry between the several positions. Column VI of Table II calls for the rhythmic type - \bar{v} - \bar{v} as the final of 12.44 per cent of all verses, or 62 verses out of five hundred. Since there are about 3280 words in five hundred lines, and 1.97 per cent of Homer's words are of the type - \bar{v} - \bar{v} , there were available in five hundred lines only about 65 words of this type. Now, the type is convenient at the beginning of the verse (as in I 13, 180, 372), beginning with the second foot (as in I 398, 530), and beginning with the fourth foot (as in I 520, 525). The claims of these positions prevented the final position from receiving its full quota of words of this type. Similar or contrary considerations must apply to other types.

Again, the influence of the common verse-tags can scarcely be measured. It is particularly noteworthy that there are many tags ending with the proper names *'Αθήνη*, *'Απόλλων*, *'Αχιλλεύς*, *'Αχαιοί*, and *'Οδυσσεύς*, all of which contribute to the explanation of the troublesome discrepancy in the third line of Table II.

Another factor was the preference for sense-pauses at certain points of the verse, a matter which we shall presently have to study. Since such pauses were rare in the last two feet but favored at the end of the fourth foot, it is not strange that verse-finals of the type $\text{---} \bar{\varepsilon}$ are more common and those of the type $\text{--} \bar{\varepsilon}$ less common than our statistics would lead us to expect. The same consideration helps to explain the great frequency of lines ending in dissyllable + trisyllable (*τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη*, etc.)—again a partial explanation of the third line of Table II.

Column VII of Table II gives a satisfactory explanation of the last two numbers for the *Iliad* in Table I. .9 per cent of 1000 lines end in a monosyllable, and 26.2 per cent in a disyllable, while 1.2 per cent of 500 lines have a word-end at 6a, and 24.8 per cent have a word-end at 5c; the two pairs of numbers would be the same if they referred to precisely the same lines. The slight difference between the 43 per cent of lines ending in $\text{---} \bar{\varepsilon}$ and the 49.8 per cent of lines with a word-end at 5b is accounted for by the few line-ends such as *μάλα δήν*, and the somewhat more frequent *σὸν Κάλχαν*, *δὲ μάντις*, etc.

As we recede from the end of the line, the possible combinations rapidly become more numerous; but we should be able to reach an approximately correct result for 5a and 4c. The attempt to do this is made in Table IV. The various possible combinations of rhythmic types are indicated at the left (a comma marks the end of a word). The Italic numbers are taken from Table II, Column VII, and represent the actual frequency of the verse-finals. The heavy-faced numbers are taken from the third columns in Table III. At the right we have the frequency of the several combinations, the actual frequency if the number is Italic, if not, the anticipated frequency.

The totals, 36.39 and 49.18, do not correspond very well with the 24.4 and 62.4 of Table I. The disturbing factor is undoubtedly the avoidance of sense pauses at 5a and 4b and the preference for sense-pauses at 4c. As we shall see, from 11 to

15 per cent of the lines of the *Iliad* have punctuation at 4c—more than at any other point within the verse. It is safe to say that at least 15 per cent of the lines had a sense-pause here. If we add 15 to 49.18 per cent of 85, the result is 56.8, which falls only a little short of the 62.4 of Table I.

TABLE IV.
INVOLVE WORD-ENDS AT 5a.

					Frequency
u u - Ȑ					16.40
- - Ȑ					.90
u, u - Ȑ	43.0	X	.199		= 8.53
u u, - Ȑ	26.2	X	.332		= 8.69
u u -, Ȑ	.9	X	.115		= .10
u, u, - Ȑ	26.2	X	.297	X	.199 = 1.58
u, u -, Ȑ	.9	X	.224	X	.199 = .04
u u, -, Ȑ	.9	X	.505	X	.332 = .15
Anticipated frequency					36.39

INVOLVE WORD-ENDS AT 4c.

					Frequency
- u u - Ȑ					8.70
- - - Ȑ					3.40
-, u u - Ȑ	16.4	X	.357		= 5.85
-, - - Ȑ	.9	X	.505		= .45
- u, u - Ȑ	43.0	X	.387		= 16.64
- u u, - Ȑ	26.2	X	.179		= 4.69
- u u -, Ȑ	.9	X	.109		= .10
-, u, u - Ȑ	43.0	X	.199	X	.357 = 3.06
-, u u, - Ȑ	26.2	X	.332	X	.357 = 3.11
-, u u -, Ȑ	.9	X	.115	X	.357 = .04
- u, u, - Ȑ	26.2	X	.297	X	.387 = 2.98
- u, - u, Ȑ	.9	X	.224	X	.387 = .08
- u u, - Ȑ	.9	X	.505	X	.179 = .08
Anticipated frequency					49.18

It appears, then, that the position of the word-ends in the *Aeneid*, and presumably in other Latin hexameter verse, is chiefly due to the poet's desire for harmony of accent and ictus in the last two feet and clash of accent and ictus in the first four feet. In the *Iliad* there are several factors, of which we have been able to identify three. (1) The comparative rarity of word-ends after the first short syllable of a foot is largely due to the fact that there is no such point in a spondee. (2) The length and rhythmic character of the available words deter-

mined the position of a large proportion of the word-ends, at least in the last two feet. (3) A favored position for a sense-pause tended to have a disproportionately large number of word-ends, and the neighboring positions to have relatively few word-ends.

While there are doubtless other factors in the problem, these are clearly the important ones. At any rate, there is no need to invoke any direct bearing of word-ends within a phrase upon the structure of the verse.

II

There can be no doubt that sense-pauses in Greek and Latin were determined by the same factors as in the modern languages, and so the opinions of modern scholars in this matter may be accepted as having some validity; but there is room for difference of opinion and of practice in regard to the pauses in one's own language, and it is much more difficult to be certain about a foreign language—especially one which is no longer used as a vernacular. It is no wonder, then, that scholars who have believed that there must be a pause in the third foot of the dactylic hexameter have usually succeeded in finding one! If we base statistics upon our own judgment of where pauses are proper, we shall probably find that the facts accord with our prepossessions.

Fortunately, however, classical texts have been punctuated by their editors without reference to a theory of caesura, and a point usually corresponds with a pause. Not all pauses are marked by any current system of punctuation, and so we cannot hope to obtain complete statistics on this basis; but probably the points are distributed through the line in about the same proportion as the pauses. In making the count, only English and American editions have been used,⁸ in the belief that the English system of punctuation is less mechanical than some others.

⁸ *Iliad*, ed. Monro and Allen; *Odyssey*, ed. Allen; Hesiod, ed. Paley; Apollonius, ed. Mooney; Theocritus, ed. Kynaston; Theognis, ed. Hudson-Williams; Vergil, ed. Hirtzel; Lucretius, ed. Kelsey; Horace, ed. Morris; Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, Laing's selections; Ovid, elegiac selections in Ramsey. The members of the Classical Proseminar in Columbia University in the spring of 1920 assisted in constructing Table V.

TABLE V.
POINTS PER 100 LINES.

Table V shows the number of points (of all kinds except [] and <>) per 100 lines in each of the seventeen possible positions, and in eight passages of Greek and as many of Latin. The figures in each column are based upon the study of 1,000 lines of text, except that less than that is available for Hesiod's *Works and Days*, for Theognis' hexameters, and for Vergil's *Eclogues*.

It appears, as was to be expected, that some of these texts have much more punctuation than others. Poems of colloquial tone, particularly if they contain much conversation, inevitably have a great deal of punctuation. Furthermore, some editors use many points and others comparatively few. Since neither kind of variation is significant for our purpose, they have both been eliminated in Table VI by reducing all the columns to a denominator of 100.

Here, as in our study of the word-ends, the differences between the two languages are more numerous and striking than the likenesses. In both languages about one-half of all pauses come at the end of the line; this was undoubtedly a cardinal element of poetic technique. A corollary of this is the avoidance of pauses at 6a; the only poet studied (Horace) that has an appreciable number of pauses at 6a, is the one who has the smallest proportion of pauses at the end of the line. In both languages there are more pauses in the third foot than in any other, while the fourth foot stands second. This also is in large part a corollary of the fondness for pauses at the end of the line; since the sixth foot is dissyllabic, the middle of the line falls late in the third foot, and the sense-pauses must tend to cluster there. Nevertheless, the differences in detail between Greek and Latin are particularly striking in these feet, and so the treatment of pauses in them can scarcely be ascribed directly to a poetic technique which was common to the writers of both languages. Another point of resemblance between the Greek and Latin hexameters is the avoidance of sense-pauses at 4b and, in a lesser degree, at 5a. I have no explanation to offer for these last peculiarities; just for that reason I suspect that they may have metrical significance.

The Greek half of Table VI shows some further features which Latin hexameters do not share. The favorite position for a pause within the line is 4c; while, after 4b and 6a, pauses are

TABLE VI.
PROPORTION OF ALL POINTS IN EACH POSITION.

most carefully avoided at 2c, and 3c, and almost as carefully at 5c. These facts remind one of the theory (discussed above, pp. 289 ff.) that word-ends were avoided at the ends of certain feet to avoid separating the line into smaller units. We had to reject the theory on the ground that word-ends are not phonetically perceptible; but there are inevitable pauses at the ends of the breath-groups, and these might well break the line into shorter units.

It seems probable, then, that the Greek poets were careful to mark the end of most hexameters by a pause; but, to avoid monotony, they occasionally obscured the metrical units (1) by an additional pause at the end of the fourth foot, or (2) by a pause at the end of the fourth foot without one at the end of the verse. The first device had the effect of a tetrameter followed by a dimeter, as in *Il. I* 116:

ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς ἐθέλω δόμεναι πάλιν, εἰ τό γ' ἄμεινον.

The second device went even further, since it left the verse-end quite unmarked, and substituted for the hexameter various incommensurate groups of units (tetrameter followed by trimeter, or by catalectic pentameter, or by some other unit), as in *Il. II* 76 f.:

'Η τοι ὁ γ' ὡς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔξετο, τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη
Νέστωρ,

and in *Il. I* 68 f.:

'Η τοι ὁ γ' ὡς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔξετο, τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη
Κάλχας Θεστορίδης.

Why this particular place of breaking the line was favored, and the breaks at 2c, 3c, and 5c disfavored, I cannot say. If we knew that the hexameter line had developed out of a couplet consisting of tetrameter and dimeter, we might regard the practice as traditional, but there is no other evidence for such an origin.⁹

Whatever the explanation may be, we must conclude that the technique of the Greek hexameter involved (1) a pause at the end of most lines, (2) frequent pauses at 4c, (3) strict avoidance of pauses at 4b and 6a, and (4) less rigorous avoidance of pauses at 2c, 3c, and throughout the fifth foot.

⁹ Witte's chain of hypotheses in *Glotta* IV, 1 ff. is not evidence.

The Latin half of Table VI shows many differences from the Greek. They fall into two groups. Pauses are not rigorously excluded from any positions in the verse except 4 b and 6 a , and a few pauses are found even in these two places. Pauses are not uncommon at 2 c and 3 c , and they are not avoided at all at 5 b and 5 c . All these differences point toward a less rigorous technique; they were perhaps indirectly due to the added difficulty which the Roman poets faced in the need to secure harmony of accent and ictus in the last two feet of the verse and clash of accent and ictus in the other four.

This latter requirement of the Latin hexameter is directly responsible for the second group of differences between the two halves of Table VI. In the first four feet we find in the Roman poets more pauses than in the Greek poets at 3 a and 4 a , positions which involve an ictus on the ultima, and fewer pauses at 3 b and 4 c , positions which usually require an ictus on the accented syllable. In the last two feet, on the contrary, the Roman poets have more pauses than the Greeks at 5 b and 5 c , positions which usually involve an ictus on the accented syllable.

It appears, then, that of the four theories which gave rise to the doctrine of caesura, the only one that is both valid and important is the theory of rhetorical pauses, which modern scholars would prefer to denominate sense-pauses, or, if thinking of phonetics as one must in the treatment of verse, ends of breath-groups. These were manipulated for the double purpose of marking the chief metrical unit, the verse, and of introducing variety by occasionally obscuring the unit. The Greek poets were particularly fond of using the break after the fourth foot for the latter purpose, while they avoided ending a breath-group in certain other places.

Nearly all deviations of Roman practice from Greek can be explained as due to the effort of the Roman poets to secure conflict of accent and ictus in the first four feet and harmony of accent and ictus in the last two feet. This fact confirms my demonstration, referred to above, that there was such an effort on the part of the Roman dactylic poets.

If the term caesura is to be retained at all, it should be used only of regular metrical pauses, such as occur in the so-called dactylic pentameter and in Asclepiadean verses.

EDGEWATER, N. J.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

II.—ORIGINAL ELEMENTS IN CICERO'S IDEAL CONSTITUTION.

Although Cicero's third book *De Legibus* is chiefly concerned with the officials of the state, it does in fact contain what we should call a fairly complete constitution, stating the fundamental law in regard to the legislative, as well as the executive and judicial, branches of the government. We have here, not a description of an ideal state and its laws, both public and private, such as is contained in the treatises of Plato and Aristotle, but an actual code of fundamental public law, corresponding closely in content and form to our idea of a "written constitution." It seems that a document of this character, whether theoretical or for practical use, had never before been produced.

The modern conception of a written constitution includes several elements.¹ First, it is entirely embodied in one—or sometimes more than one—specially important document. Second, it is a product of conscious art, "the result of a deliberate effort on the part of a state to lay down once for all a body of coherent provisions under which its government shall be established and conducted." Third, it is of the rigid type; i. e., it stands "above the other laws of the state"; it "is repealable in a different way, exerts a superior force." Exactly such a constitution, of course, is that of the United States. The unwritten constitution, on the other hand, consists to a great extent of customary law, although it may be partially embodied in statutes, is of gradual growth, and is "promulgated or repealed in the same way as ordinary laws." Well-known examples of this type are the Roman and British constitutions.

No ancient state had a written or rigid constitution such as has been described. Complete and consciously produced codes of law, including constitutional provisions, existed, of course. But, as has been stated, the collection of "laws" in *De Legibus* III is the only ancient document which seems to correspond to the modern idea of a constitution of this kind. It is a single, consciously produced document, confining itself strictly to fun-

¹ For the following definitions see Bryce, *Studies in History and Jurisprudence*, Oxford, 1901, pp. 126 ff.

damental public law, according to our definition of public law. But here we must note that the Roman definition was more inclusive than that usually accepted today. The three divisions of Roman public law were *sacra*, *sacerdotes* and *magistratus*.² Therefore the laws in Book II—the basic provisions for the established religion of the state—form a part of Cicero's code of fundamental public law. This body of religious law is, however, considered an entirely distinct branch of the constitution, and those parts of it which have a political significance are for the most part repeated in the political section.

Was Cicero, then, the originator of this new idea of a "written constitution" of the type common in modern times? Did he intend his laws actually to be put in force as the constitution of a reformed Roman Republic, and protected from easy repeal by being placed "above the other laws of the state"? A number of clues to Cicero's thought in regard to his code can be found in the *De Legibus*, but they do not enable us to answer these questions completely. Certainly he did not anticipate any immediate practical use being made of these laws, but was looking forward to a possible reform of the Roman state and its government in the indefinite future. He implies in one passage³ that they were written *non rei publicae sed studii et delectationis causa*, and again he admits that they would not be suitable to the degenerate Romans of his own day, but are intended for a future body of Roman citizens, who may return to the virtues and ideals of their ancestors.⁴ But when we ask exactly how Cicero thought his code might be used by those future Romans we find ourselves in the realm of conjecture.

There is one element of the modern written constitution which Cicero might certainly have had in mind. That is its rigidity; the fact that it is more difficult to repeal than other laws. For although the Roman people in their assemblies, like the British Parliament, could theoretically pass any law, and

² Ulpian Dig. I, 1, 1, 2; Publicum ius est quod ad statum rei Romanae spectat, . . . Publicum ius in sacris, in sacerdotibus, in magistratibus consistit.

³ II, 14.

⁴ III, 29: . . . non enim de hoc senatu nec his de hominibus qui nunc sunt, sed de futuris, si qui forte his legibus parere voluerint, haec habetur oratio.

therefore repeal any law, there were certain legislative acts which they felt practically bound not to perform. Any intentional invasion of the rights of the gods was unthinkable, and any accidental interference with such rights was carefully guarded against in the preambles to all laws.⁵ Laws which took the form of agreements between the Roman commonwealth and another party, such as treaties, for example, were put under the protection of the gods by being sworn to by a magistrate as the official representative of the state.⁶ The nation was bound by a similar oath to the fundamental constitutional duty of maintaining the republican form of government; i. e., of never allowing the monarchy to be restored.⁷ Laws thus sworn to were considered either absolutely irrevocable, or, in the case of agreements with foreign nations or individuals, revocable only under certain definite conditions, although from an abstract legal point of view this was of course not the case.

There was another kind of law of an intermediate class, which held a position above that of ordinary laws. Such were the self-imposed rules which regulated the law-making activities of the assembly.⁸ An example is the law against *privilegia*. A bill which violated one of these rules could not become a law until the regulating law had been repealed. For example, a law containing a *privilegium* would not be valid unless the general law prohibiting *privilegia* had been repealed before it was passed. In the later Republic the repeal of any of these general regulations would hardly have been thought of; they were embodied in ancient laws which were considered a permanent part of the constitution. Hence the idea of his "laws" being made superior to other laws might easily have existed in Cicero's mind.

But it is more difficult to suppose that he had any definite idea of the existence of such a thing as a rigid, written constitution, put in force all at once as the basic law of a state. There is a possibility, of course, that he thought of some future *dictator rei publicae constituendae*, more moderate and scrupu-

⁵ Mommsen, Roem. Staatsrecht III, p. 335, n. 2.

⁶ Op. cit. I, pp. 235 f.

⁷ Op. cit. III, p. 362; II, p. 16.

⁸ Op. cit. III, pp. 334 ff.; 360 ff.

lous than Sulla,—such a man as he had hoped Pompey might turn out to be—who would use his constitution approximately in that way. But he would have been more likely to think of such a reformer's using it as a basis for a complete new code of law, which would include private as well as public law, as all the codes of the past had done; or else as a guide in the reform of the existing constitution.

It seems clear, at any rate, that Cicero did approach more closely to the modern idea of a written constitution than any other ancient statesman or political theorist. Whether he fully realized it or not, he actually seems to have written the first constitution of this kind in existence. And this new idea of drafting a document containing a complete constitution, and excluding all other kinds of law, is probably the most striking element of originality in the *De Legibus*.

The problem of discovering the original elements in the individual laws is much more concrete. Absolutely new provisions are, of course, rare. Cicero was an eclectic in political theory as well as in other branches of philosophy.⁹ Most of his originality appears in provisions which have the character of compromises, and the resulting balanced constitution is an attempt to find the golden mean between the extremes of different periods and different parties. One of the most interesting things about the code is its clear-cut treatment of the unwritten elements of the Roman constitution—the *mores maiorum*. Some of these unwritten rules were less definite than others, and in many cases their interpretation and validity were matters of party strife. The portions of this body of unwritten law which Cicero adopts are here embodied by him in definite written form.

Let us first consider the changes which are recommended by Cicero in the legal status of the Senate. By *eius decreta rata sunt*¹⁰ nothing can be meant except that senatorial decrees are to be classed definitely as laws of the state. This had certainly never been the fact from a strictly legal point of view, although custom had made it practically true to a great extent. By this provision another independent legislative body is added to the assemblies of the whole people and of the plebs. In his

⁹ Cf. Cauer, *Ciceros politisches Denken*, Berlin 1903, pp. 8 ff.

¹⁰ § 10.

commentary,¹¹ however, Cicero makes it clear that the legislative power of the assemblies is to remain superior to that of the Senate, which would make it possible for one of the assemblies to repeal a law passed by the Senate. And he evidently had no idea of recommending any great changes in the relative spheres of action of Senate and People, as is clear from his other laws.

His intention to establish legally and to increase to some extent the powers of the Senate is shown in other passages of the laws also. The minor officials, including the quaestors, are to be legally bound to execute all commands of the Senate in addition to performing their regular functions.¹² We have no evidence that the Senate ever actually had any such legal rights over these officials. Also, the number of praetors may be fixed by senatorial decree as well as by popular law,¹³ and the appointment of a dictator is made absolutely dependent on the Senate's decree,¹⁴ the consul being deprived of all discretion in the matter.

The most important actual change made by these "laws" is the provision of a firm legal basis for the power which the Senate already held practically, thus removing the most important claims of the Senate from the realm of controversy. As we have seen, however, no attempt is made to deprive the People of their legal supremacy.

Cicero's provision in regard to membership in the Senate is somewhat obscure: *omnes magistratus auspicium iudiciumque habento, exque is senatus esto.*¹⁵ This might be thought to mean that all magistrates are automatically to become members of the Senate. Another interpretation is that Cicero was thinking only of the *magistratus maiores*; this would mean that the requirement for entrance would be the holding of the aedileship. Or Cicero might merely have meant that only men who had held some magistracy could be admitted to the Senate, leaving the decision as to which ex-magistrates should become senators to the censors.

The first interpretation seems most unlikely, as such a rule

¹¹ § 28: *cum potestas in populo. auctoritas in senatu sit . . .*

¹² § 6: *quodcumque senatus creverit agunto.*

¹³ § 8: *quotecumque senatus creverit populusve iusserit, tot sunt.*

¹⁴ § 8: . . . *si senatus creverit . . .*

¹⁵ § 10.

would give seats in the Senate to all the young men who had held any of the offices of what was later called the *vigintivirate*, as well as to the ex-quaestors. The second interpretation seems to be excluded by the fact that Cicero expressly says *omnes magistratus*. The third explanation of Cicero's words seems to be the only reasonable one. If we accept it, we must interpret the words *sublata cooptatione censoria*¹⁶ as abrogating the censors' legal right to go outside the list of ex-magistrates in their choice. This law, then, simply embodies in definite form approximately the practice actually followed for some time before the reforms of Sulla. It is a compromise between the older principle of free choice by the censors and the Sullan law attaching entrance to the Senate to the holding of a particular magistracy. Cicero obviously had in mind the method of choice actually in use; i. e., that a vacancy should normally be filled by the ex-magistrate of highest rank who was not already a member, with due regard for moral character.¹⁷ He says nothing about the number of senators being fixed, but we may suppose that this was taken for granted. In most cases, of course, this left the censors little actual power in the matter, and we must agree with Cicero's statement¹⁸ that this is a democratic provision, as it practically left the choice of senators to the people.

Two innovations in regard to the popular assemblies may be noted. In the first place, the method of voting proposed by Cicero¹⁹ seems to be quite original. It embodies a compromise between the old method of *viva voce* voting and the secret ballot used in Cicero's own time. The people are to have the ballot and freedom in the use of it, but it is no longer to be secret; a man's ballot is to be shown to any of the *optimates* who wish to see it or to whom he wishes to exhibit it.²⁰ This plan preserves

¹⁶ In Cicero's commentary, § 27.

¹⁷ § 7: *Censores . . . probrum in senatu ne relinquonto.* § 10: *Is ordo vitio vacato.* Cf. commentary, § 29: *nam cum omni vitio carere lex iubeat, ne veniet quidem in eum ordinem quisquam vitii particeps.*

¹⁸ § 27: *populare sane neminem in summum locum nisi per populum venire sublata cooptatione censoria.*

¹⁹ § 10: *Creatio magistratum, iudicia populi, iussa vetita cum suffragio coscissentur, optumatibus nota, plebi libera sunt.* Cf. Cicero's commentary, §§ 33-39.

²⁰ In regard to this law, the question at once arises: exactly whom

the power and freedom of the assembly, but also gives full opportunity for the exertion of influence or pressure on individual voters by the aristocracy.

The other *novum* in regard to the assemblies is the rule making the presiding magistrate legally responsible for any use of force or similar irregularity at meetings of an assembly.²¹ Cicero quotes a precedent for putting the blame on the presiding official in such cases, since he had the power of dismissing the assembly at any time, but it is clear that this responsibility had never been fixed by law, and that such officials had never been liable to prosecution. This law certainly makes them so liable.²²

In the provisions in regard to the state officials there are several interesting points to be noticed. The law which fixes the rank of the aedile²³ is rather obscure. As this office is taken up immediately after the minor magistracies, the treatment following the ascending order, Cicero may have intended to indicate by this sentence merely that he was now passing to the *maiores*, the aedileship being the lowest of these, and occupying a sort of middle ground between the two classes. But considering the extreme conciseness of these laws, it seems that he must have meant more than what would have been obvious to his readers without being stated. If so, the meaning can only be that the aedileship is to be a necessary preliminary to the holding of the offices above it. In that case, Cicero is proposing a legally fixed *cursus honorum*. In his provisions in regard to the minor magistracies, the quaestorship is put on the same basis as the various offices of the so-called *vigintivirate*. Clearly one of these minor magistracies was to be held first, and then the aedileship, praetorship and consulship.

The fact that the plebeian tribunate is not mentioned at all among the regular magistracies is of course natural, since the

did Cicero mean by *optimates* and by *optimus quisque et gravissimus civis* (§ 39)? Such indefinite expressions could not be used in an actual law, certainly. Here Cicero's proposal is very far from being in legal form. Perhaps the privilege of examining ballots was to be confined to senators, but we cannot be certain.

²¹ § 11: Ast quid turbassit in agendo, *fraus actoris* esto. Cf. commentary, § 42.

²² § 42: . . . cuius impunitatem amittit hac lege.

²³ § 8: ollisque ad honoris amplioris gradum is primus ascensus esto.

tribune was not a Roman magistrate. But it seems probable that Cicero, in his arrangement of the *cursus honorum*, was once again attempting a compromise; this time between the absence of the requirement of any definite minor office or offices as a preliminary to the praetorship, which made it possible for the tribune to advance directly to this office, and Sulla's law which closed the higher offices of the state to the tribune. If this interpretation is correct, Cicero, while leaving the path of advancement open to the tribune, was proposing to prohibit him from omitting the aedileship, thus lessening the importance of the tribunate as a means of political advancement.

The most striking innovations of the whole code are those which refer to the censorship. They amount to a complete revival and reconstitution of the office. No change is made in its rank, as it occupies in Cicero's treatment its normal position between the aedileship and the praetorship. But the office is to be occupied continuously instead of intermittently, and the term is therefore lengthened to five years.²⁴ Functions borrowed from Greece, but entirely strange to Rome, are assigned to the censors.²⁵ They are to be responsible for the correctness of the text of the laws, and also to receive reports from all magistrates after their retirement from office and to render a preliminary or tentative decision upon their official acts. But a favorable decision by the censors is not to free the ex-magistrate from the liability to prosecution. Another rather indefinite duty seems to be assigned to them as *νομοφύλακες*.²⁶ They are to "observe the acts of men and recall them to the laws." That is, the general task is assigned to them of watching for violations of the law and calling attention to them. We may conjecture that illegality in official acts was chiefly thought of in this provision.

²⁴ § 7: *Magistratum quinquennium habento . . . ea potestas semper esto.* Cf. § 47: . . . censoribus, quando quidem eos in republica semper volumus esse.

²⁵ § 11: *Censores fidem legum custodiunt; privati ad eos acta referunt; nec eo magis lege liberi sunt.* Cf. commentary, §§ 46-47.

²⁶ § 46: *nec ei solum litteras, nam id quidem etiam apud maiores nostros erat, sed etiam facta hominum observabant ad legesque revocabant.* Haec cura detur censoribus, . . . Cf. Daremburg et Saglio, Dict., s. v. *Nomophylakes*; Pauly-Wiss., s. v. *Demetrius von Phaleron*, Sp. 2825 f.

Perhaps this new duty of the censors is on the whole no more shadowy and indefinite than the supervision over morals traditionally exercised by them. Its introduction into the Roman state was undoubtedly suggested to Cicero by his admiration for Demetrius of Phaleron.²⁷

The most radical of these innovations in the censorship is the proposal to introduce into Rome the Greek *εὐθύνη* in modified form. Though the preliminary judgment of the censors did not preclude prosecution, it would have had very great influence, of course, and it seems probable that Cicero, in drafting this law, was thinking, as he so often was, of his own banishment. Was he not seeking to give additional protection to the magistrate who had clearly acted for the best interests of the state, but who, by a technical violation of the law, had laid himself open to malicious prosecution? This appears to be the most likely motive for such a radical proposal.

Perhaps this same idea will give us a clue to the meaning of one of Cicero's provisions in regard to the consuls: *olis salus populi suprema lex esto.*²⁸ This has been understood as referring to the freedom of action given by the *senatus consultum ultimum*. But such an interpretation seems to be out of the question, on account of the lack of any reference to the Senate. If this had been Cicero's meaning, it seems certain that he would have expressed his law in such a manner that the phrase *si senatus creverit* could have been included in it. To interpret this provision as referring to the consul's military command²⁹ also seems forced. The only other possible interpretation—one which has been universally rejected as unthinkable—seems to be the literal one that Cicero actually intended to place the consuls above the law, thus making an exception to the first provision in his code.³⁰ I believe, however, that this interpretation is the only reasonable one, and that Cicero here intends to give the consul extraordinary powers in cases of emergency, without the necessity of action by the Senate. In spite of the radical nature

²⁷ § 14.

²⁸ § 8.

²⁹ As is done by Du Mesnil in his edition of *De Legibus*, Leipzig 1879, p. 207.

³⁰ § 6: *Iusta imperia sunt.* Cf. Du Mesnil's note, op. cit. p. 195.

of such a concession, it probably seemed to Cicero that in actual practice there would be little danger in it. After retiring from office the consul would be subject to judgment by the censors, and then would be liable to prosecution for any illegal acts committed. In order to claim the protection of this *suprema lex*, it would be necessary for him to prove that "the safety of the people" had been in actual danger, and that his transgression of the ordinary laws of the state had been necessary for its preservation.

If this was Cicero's intention, he must, of course, have been thinking once more of his own banishment, and providing another safeguard for the protection of a consul who saved the state by acts which were technically illegal.³¹ But there was a theoretical reason as well as a practical one for the granting of this power to the consul. Cicero must have seen that the consulship was the weakest point in the identification of the theoretical "balanced constitution" of the Greeks with the actual constitution of Rome. The "royal element" was conspicuously lacking in strength in these theoretical laws in comparison with the aristocratic and democratic, particularly after the establishment of the power of the Senate on a firm legal basis. The consulship must therefore be strengthened. For this purpose the *senatus consultum ultimum* is dropped entirely, and the extraordinary powers which it was thought of as conferring are granted outright to the consul, to be used in his discretion whenever needed, but with the knowledge that he would be held strictly responsible for their use.³²

The law prohibiting *legationes liberae*³³ is also a new provision. Cicero had proposed the abolition of this form of senatorial graft during his consulship, but had succeeded only in reducing the length of such appointments, formerly unlimited, to one year.

The last of our list of innovations is Cicero's general rule in regard to punishments.³⁴ The principle that the punishment

³¹ Cf. Cauer, Ciceros politisches Denken, pp. 114 f.

³² The use of the phrase *nemini parento* (§ 8) may be considered as an additional indication of Cicero's intention to strengthen the power of the consulship.

³³ § 9; cf. commentary, § 18.

³⁴ § 11: *Quod quis earum rerum migrassit, noxiae poena par esto;* cf. commentary, § 46.

should fit the crime was in more or less general agreement with the practice in Rome as well as elsewhere. But the formulation of a constitutional provision to the effect that the kind of punishment was always to correspond in this way to the nature of the crime seems to be original.

The elements which are revivals of old laws repealed before Cicero's time are few. The only provisions which can be so classified with any degree of certainty are that which allows the punishment of citizens by flogging,³⁵ and that which limits the right of appeal to the city of Rome.³⁶ Both these provisions are intended to restore some of the lost power of the higher magistrates, and can perhaps be explained in the same way as the additions to the consul's power—that is, as attempts to strengthen the royal element in the state. The provision in regard to the dictatorship cannot, of course, be classed as a revival of an institution which had been abolished, as this office was still recognized as a part of the existing Roman constitution.

The element of the constitution which would perhaps seem strangest to the modern legal mind is the occasional introduction of provisions of a moral rather than a legal nature—provisions which could not be made into enforceable laws. Such are some of the stipulations as to the conduct of military commanders and provincial governors,³⁷ the exhortation to the Senate to set a good example to the rest of the citizens,³⁸ the recommendation of moderation to legislative bodies,³⁹ the statement of the political duty of a senator,⁴⁰ and the praise given to the official who uses the power of intercession in a helpful way.⁴¹ Such rules, for which there could be no sanction, would not seem so out of place in an ancient code as in a modern one. And Cicero's love for the old spirit of republican patriotism,

³⁵ § 6: *multa vinculis verberibus coherceto.* Cf. Mommsen, Roem. Strafrecht, p. 47.

³⁶ § 6: *Militiae ab eo qui imperabit provocatio nec esto.* Cf. Strachan-Davidson, Problems of the Roman Criminal Law, Oxford 1912, Vol. I, pp. 115-126.

³⁷ § 9: *Populi sui gloriam augento; domum cum laude redeunto.*

³⁸ § 10: *ceteris specimen esto.*

³⁹ § 10: *quae cum populo quaeque in patribus agentur modica sunt.*

⁴⁰ § 11: *Loco senator et modo orato; causas populi teneto.*

⁴¹ § 11: *Intercessor rei malae salutaris civis esto.*

and his desire for its restoration, must have suggested these exhortations to political righteousness. Each one of them is a rebuke to one of the political evils or abuses of the time, which was out of reach of the law. But, futile as such rebukes were, Cicero was unable to devise a practical remedy.

It seems strange that comparatively so little attention has been paid to the *De Legibus* by modern authors who have discussed Cicero's political theories and ideals. Is this not pre-eminently the place to look for Cicero's best thought-out conclusions as to the reforms needed by the Roman state, and the constitution best suited to it? Here he is concrete and detailed; in other works, including the *De Republica*, he is abstract and indefinite. In his letters to Atticus he is extremely frank, to be sure, but the political opinions found there are often the hasty thoughts of the moment, largely influenced by personal considerations.

Let us see, then, what kind of a constitution it is, on the whole, which Cicero presents as his ideal. Are we to conclude, with Cauer, that in spite of its pretence to perfect balance it is predominantly aristocratic, with only a few sops thrown to the multitude in the shape of worthless "democratic concessions"?⁴²

As we have just seen, the constitution bears on its face the appearance of being a compromise between the extreme aristocracy, best represented by the reactionary constitution of Sulla, and the extreme proposals of the *populares*. Is this appearance a false one? The power of the Senate is definitely established, but not greatly increased. Additions are made to the duties and influence of the censorship, to the discretionary power of the consuls in times of emergency, and to the judicial powers of the higher magistrates. On the other hand, no attempt is made to limit the supreme power of the People in their assemblies; the Senate is given none of its old control over popular legislation. The rights of the plebeian tribunes are not limited, and the path of political advancement remains open to them. A compromise method of voting in the assemblies is recommended, which gives freedom of action to the people, but leaves the way as open as possible for the exertion of aristocratic influence over them.

⁴² Cauer, op. cit., pp. 41 f. and 88 f.

The provision last mentioned, it seems to me, gives the keynote of the whole system, and of Cicero's idea of a balanced constitution. Absolute power is given to the People, but as many opportunities as possible are provided for the play of senatorial influence upon this all-powerful democracy. This influence is to be strengthened even by the use of deceit, when necessary.⁴³ Obviously we must give full assent to Cauer's conclusion that Cicero believed all the political wisdom of Rome to be the exclusive property of one class, the senatorial, which supplied the aristocratic and royal elements in his ideal state. But I think this fact has led Cauer to underestimate the genuinely democratic elements in Cicero's constitution. If he thinks of the common people as entirely lacking in political wisdom, why has he given them the supreme power in the state? Simply because he recognizes the great fact that, in any form of state, they actually possess the supreme power. This fact he had doubtless learned from practical experience as well as from the treatises of the Greek theorists, who realize it fully, and recognize that a government whose laws do not grant the supreme power to those who actually hold it cannot hope to be a stable one. This point of view, in my opinion, gives a complete explanation of Cicero's constitution as we have it. Only the aristocracy⁴⁴ can govern the state wisely, but it cannot govern the state at all, except with the full approval of the People. This approval is in general to be gained by persuasion; but when this is found impossible, by trickery based on popular superstition. But no attempt is to be made to *force* the will of the governing class upon the People. Cicero, of course, like the rest of the *optimates*, thinks of the People's combination of political power with entire lack of political wisdom as an evil, but he differs basically from the extreme conservatives in his realization that the maintenance of this power is absolutely necessary.⁴⁵

⁴³ II, §§ 30-31.

"Naturally Cicero, remembering his own origin, could not have thought of this aristocracy as a close corporation, which did not admit new blood. But just as a definite order was to be observed in holding the state offices, so membership in the governing class must be attained gradually, by passing through the preliminary stage of membership in the equestrian order, consisting of those citizens who had an especially large "stake in the country." Cf. Zielinski, Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte, 3. Aufl., p. 149.

"A somewhat similar distrust of real "popular government" was

Of course the readers of Cicero's treatise would be members of the governing class. Therefore he lays the greatest emphasis in his commentary on the defence of the democratic elements in his constitution, not on that of the most original elements. The space which he gives to upholding the retention of the tribunate with full powers⁴⁶ against the conservative arguments of Quintus and Atticus, and to the defense of his compromise form of ballot⁴⁷ is out of all proportion to the short passage devoted, for example, to his radical additions to the duties of the censorship.⁴⁸ In fact, for the benefit of this conservative reading public he takes pains to minimize the amount of new material in his constitution—almost to deny its existence.⁴⁹

Thus we must conclude that the idea of a balanced constitution was more than an attractive theory of political philosophy to Cicero; he took it seriously as an ideal of practical politics, as Zielinski maintains. This was certainly the case at the time when the constitution in *De Legibus* was written, which of course does not prove that Zielinski has not overemphasized his consistent adherence to it throughout his career.

We have not yet touched upon one element in Cicero's ideas which has been emphasized by both Zielinski⁵⁰ and Cauer.⁵¹ This is Cicero's idealization of the period of the Scipios, including the Roman government as constituted at that time. From our examination of the changes in the constitution which Cicero

shown by the makers of the Constitution of the United States, particularly in their careful avoidance of provisions for the choice of the President and Senate by direct popular election.

⁴⁶ §§ 17; 19-26.

⁴⁷ §§ 33-39.

⁴⁸ §§ 46-47. A comprehension of Cicero's point of view in this respect may go far to explain the "unevenness of treatment" which has been so often mentioned as a characteristic of the commentary on the "laws." (For example, see A. Reifferscheid, in *Rh. Mus.* 17 (1862), p. 269.)

⁴⁹ II, § 23: *Si quae forte a me hodie rogabuntur, quae non sint in nostra re publica nec fuerint, tamen erunt fere in more maiorum, qui tum ut lex valebat.* III, § 12: *Nihil habui sane non multum quod putarem novandum in legibus.* But compare III, § 37: *Quoniam non recognoscimus nunc leges populi Romani sed aut repetimus eretas aut novas scribimus*

⁵⁰ Op. cit. pp. 183-188.

⁵¹ Op. cit. pp. 33 f.

actually recommends in his "laws," it is obvious without further comment that he has attempted to bring the Roman constitution into perfect conformity with his ideal balanced form of government, not by a return to the actual laws of Scipio's time, but by means of new laws which are either compromises or entirely original. Reverence for the earlier Roman constitution is much more prominent in the generalizations of the *De Republica* than in the definite constitution contained in the *De Legibus*. The conservative statements of the former work, and Cicero's claims to conservatism in the *De Legibus*, have evidently had the effect of concealing from modern critics, to a great extent, the innovations which actually appear in that treatise.

The political spirit of the age of the Scipios seems to have awakened Cicero's fullest admiration. He conceived of it as a time when the people gave their willing assent to the efficient government of a wise and patriotic aristocracy. And he accepted fully the Greek theory that the constitution of the older Roman republic had come closer than any other to an ideal balance of powers. But his loyalty and admiration did not extend to the detailed provisions of the constitution of the period he admired, and therefore his proposed reforms are to be brought about by new methods rather than by an attempt to restore those provisions.

Cicero not only compares the spirit of his own times unfavorably with his idealized conception of the spirit of the older Republic; he even goes so far as to recognize frankly that his ideal constitution would have no chance for practical success in his own day. Therefore we have considered Cicero's political ideals entirely apart from the political conditions under which he lived. Indeed there is little actual relation between the two. For those conditions he obviously had little real understanding, and therefore he could provide no cure for the ills of a dying Republic. But certainly, in the constitution which he composed for a Roman Republic of the ideal future, he has shown far more originality than has ever been recognized.

CLINTON WALKER KEYES.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

III.—THE CARMEN SAECULARE OF HORACE.

When the Carmen Saeculare of Horace was rendered on the Palatine hill before Apollo's temple it was of course sung to a rhythmic dance, since the invitations issued for the occasion mention not only the singing but the "choros habendos."¹ How the strophes were divided between the youths, maidens, and the ensemble has not been discovered despite many attempts at divination.² However, many editors have agreed that the ninth stanza was divided between the youths and maidens and sung antiphonally. That at least seems to be implied in the text:

Condito mitis placidusque telo
Supplices audi *pueros Apollo*;
Siderum regina bicornis audi
Luna pueras.

The assumption of responsion in this stanza is based upon the supposition that the semichoruses would, so far as possible, have appropriate texts. That is quite reasonable, for this was a religious song, and the Romans were meticulous in their acts of worship: Apollo did not accept the same victims at the altar as Diana, nor was it customary for women to bring the same offerings as men. Unfortunately, this principle when applied to the song does not carry us far enough, though it at once suggests that the first two and the last stanza would be sung by the full chorus, that the third belongs to the youths, the fourth to the maidens, the seventeenth to the youths and the eighteenth to the maidens.

The ninth stanza, however, has another peculiarity. In the third line, the trochaic caesura unexpectedly appears, and this fact may provide an objective criterion capable of helping us

¹ CIL VI. 32323, 1. 21.

² As Shorey has said: "The distribution of the strophes between the youths, the maidens, and the ensemble has been endlessly debated," Shorey-Laing, p. 471. See Christ, Sitz. Bayer. Acad. 1893 (six triads); Mommsen, *Reden und Aufsätze*, p. 358 (a processional); Vahlen, Sitz. Berl. Akad. 1892, p. 1005 (objections to Mommsen's view); Dennison, Univ. Mich. Studies, 1904, p. 49. For references to many others, see Schanz.

further. It is well known that Horace avoided the trochaic caesura almost entirely in the Sapphics of the first three books of odes. The Carmen Saeculare is the first Sapphic ode in which he uses it freely. Here it suddenly occurs nineteen times. We know of course very little about the theory of the caesura. It has even been held that rhetoricians did not become conscious of or study its effects until after the Augustan age. But a verse like Horace, *Ars Poetica*, 263:

Non quivis videt immodulata poemata judex,

in which Horace illustrates ignorance of modulation by omitting the regular caesura, is proof enough that the poet has some rule in mind.

The avoidance of the trochaic caesura in the first three books, while it is freely used in the Carmen Saeculare and subsequent Sapphics, is not satisfactorily explained by Christ's additive theory⁸ of verse. It is not at all unlikely that the theory which we first find in Hermogenes, *de Ideis* II, 394 R., a theory that advocates variation in tone and color by manipulation of the pauses, was known and practiced before the days of Vergil and Horace. Certain it is that Vergil in his hexameters uses the trochaic deliberately for smooth, flowing, and soft effects when the text demands them. One need not search far in the *Aeneid* for lines like:

Luna premit suadentque cadentia sidera somnos.
Per connubia nostra per inceptos hymenaeos.
Spargens humida mella soporiferumque papaver.

Of course the Romans never spoke of caesuras as "masculine" and "feminine"—terms invented by Hermann; but if a poet were attempting to employ the caesuras in such a way as to give a different effect to the stanzas composed for the female voices he would of course give to them the softer trochaic caesura rather than the emphatic stop after the accent. This is what Horace seems to have done in the Carmen Saeculare.

Even with this criterion, we cannot expect definitive results, since there are ensemble parts which must have one or the

⁸Christ, *Sitz. Bayer. Akad.*, 1868; Heinze, *Sitz. Leip. Akad.* 1918, seems to have put an end to the additive theory as far as concerns Horace.

other of these two caesuras. But the following rule makes for a reasonable division: stanzas sung by youths alone have the "masculine" caesura, stanzas sung by maidens alone have one or more trochaic caesuras in each stanza, ensemble stanzas also contain trochaic caesuras.

Beginning our inquiry at stanza nine, which affords the best clue, we find that the three central stanzas (9, 10, 11) shift from masculine to feminine caesura on the third line. The three are apparently sung antiphonally by the two semi-choruses—

Youths: Condito mitis || placidusque telo
Suplices audi || *pueros, Apollo;*

Maidens: Siderum regina || bicornis audi,
Luna, puellas.

Youths: Roma si vestrumst || opus Iliaeque
Litus Etruscum || tenuere turmae,

Maidens: Jussa pars mutare || Lares et urbem
Sospite cursu,

Youths: Cui per ardentem || sine fraude Trojam
Castus Aeneas || patriae superstes

Maidens: Liberum munivit || iter daturus
Plura relictis.

This mesodos of three stanzas is probably the only part of the poem in which stanzas are divided in the middle. The three stanzas clearly belong together referring throughout to Apollo and Diana, for as Vahlen has shown (*op. cit.*, p. 1020) the sixth ode of the fourth book also attributes the salvation of the Aeneadae to Apollo and Diana. We thus learn that these two deities hold the position of honor in the central passage which is thus emphasized by the most elaborate and effective rendering. The twelfth and thirteenth stanzas are addressed to the unnamed Capitoline triad, as appears from the mention of the "bobus albis." The twelfth (which has no trochaic caesura) is assigned to the youths, the thirteenth (with its one trochee) to the maidens.

The next three stanzas make up a kind of triumphal hymn which seems to suit the full chorus; the trochaic pause occurs

freely in this group.⁴ Finally the masculine lines of the seventeenth (addressed to Apollo) are given to the youths, those of the eighteenth stanza (addressed to Diana) with one weak pause, are assigned to the maidens, while the nineteenth stanza, the epode, falls to the full chorus. The division of this part is therefore: mesode, 1, 1, 3, 1, 1, epode.

The first part of the ode opens with a proodos of two stanzas in full chorus. The first stanza has a trochaic caesura, the second has none, the only stanza thus deficient of those assignable to the full chorus. The third (addressed to Sol-Apollo) was sung by the youths, the next two (addressed to Ilithyia-Lucina, several trochees) is assigned to the maidens, while the next three—all masculine lines—go to the youths who pray for prosperity during the next saeculum. The stanzas of the first half fall into the following order: proode, 1, 2, 3, mesode.

According to this hypothesis the whole poem arranges itself by stanzas as follows:

1	choral	
2	proodos	Youths and maidens sing to Apollo and Diana.
3	youths	Prayer to Sol-Apollo.
4-5	maidens	Prayer to Ilithyia-Diana.
6-7-8	youths	Prosper Rome through the next saeculum!
9-10-11	antiphonal mesodos	Apollo and Diana are recognized as the founders of Rome.
12	youths	May Jupiter and Juno prosper
13	maidens	citizens and ruler.
14-15-16	full chorus	Song of joy: the age of peace returns.
17	youths	Prayer to Apollo.
18	maidens	Prayer to Diana.
19	full chorus	epodos: the gods have heard our prayers.

It will be seen that a division of the hymn according to caesuras secures a reasonable amount of symmetry, not only separating it into two equal parts by an antiphonal mesodos but also arranging the two parts into systems. The first half

⁴The hymn continues through two stanzas, while in the third the chorus wheels before the temple of Apollo again.

seems to use a progressive idea, while the second sets a frame for the song of triumph. This division also secures appropriate texts for the two choruses. The proode, epode, and song of triumph fall to the full chorus, the mesode to a more intricate responsion, the direct addresses to Apollo fall to the youths, while those to Diana are sung by the maidens. It must have been very difficult to secure such a coincidence of caesura, symmetry, and appropriateness of theme, so difficult in fact that conscious effort alone would seem to me responsible for it. There are only two instances where coincidence between the three principles is in any way lacking, namely in the second stanza, where no trochaic caesura is found in a choral song, and in the sixteenth, where the full chorus turns to address Apollo alone.

This division, if adopted, will have some bearing upon the interpretation of various lines. It will for example refer the tenth and eleventh stanzas to Apollo and Diana rather than to the "Di" of the following lines, as Kiessling-Heinze's edition would do. This change in turn alters the whole conception of the ode. Instead of giving the position of honor in the second half to Jupiter and Juno as Kiessling held, it interprets the whole central antiphonal as sung in praise of Apollo and Diana, thus reducing the Capitoline deities (who are not even named) to the two obscure stanzas that follow. This is in fact what Horace himself has quite clearly said when at the end he calls the chorus:

Doctus et Phoebi chorus et Dianae
Dicere laudes,

and again in Carmen IV, 6, when he attributes the salvation of the Trojans to these gods,⁵ and in ll. 37-38 of that ode speaks of his chorus:

Rite Latonae puerum canentes
Rite crescentem face Noctilucam.

This arrangement proves of course that the song was in every respect a hymn in honor of Apollo and Diana, and, despite Kiessling's notes, it shows that Apollo is intentionally

⁵Vahlen, *op. cit.*, and Slaughter, Trans. Am. Phil. Ass. 1895, pp. 77 ff., have rightly insisted that the Carmen Saeculare gave markedly little attention to the Capitoline triad.

identified with Sol in line 9, and that Ilithyia is intended to be connected with Diana Lucina. In view of these facts I would propose the following changes in the punctuation of Kiessling-Heinze's edition: a full stop should be placed after the eighth line, a semicolon after the twentieth, a colon after the thirty-sixth and a full stop after the forty-fourth and the fifty-second lines.

Moreover, if the peculiar meter of the Carmen is found to be the result of an attempt to harmonize form and spirit in certain stanzas, we may have the long-sought clue to Horace's reasons for experimenting with a new rhythm at the close of his career. The odes of the fourth book which have this rhythm are all apparently later: the sixth was written while the chorus was practicing the performance of the Carmen, the second belongs to the year 16 B. C., and the eleventh is generally considered one of the last lyrics (see the final lines). Horace's adoption of the trochaic caesura has usually been attributed to a manipulation of the additive theory of verse which we find in Caesius Bassus. But the whole theory is now under severe criticism. The nature of the Carmen Saeculare should at least be considered as a possible factor in the treatment of Horace's meters.

TENNEY FRANK.

IV.—FLUCTUATION BETWEEN *o*- AND *ā*-STEMS IN LITHUANIAN.

A striking feature of Lithuanian declension, which is not recognized in the grammars, is the frequent appearance of the same noun in two or more stem forms. An extreme example is a word for 'lunar halo or corona' which appears (Nesselmann Dict. 156) in five stem forms: *drigna* -os, *drignè* -és, *drignas* -o, *drignis* -io, *drignus* -aus. But there are well above 500 Lithuanian nouns with at least two different stem forms. More than half of these fluctuations are those between *o*- and *jo*-stems on the one hand and *ā*- and *jā*-stems on the other hand. Three fourths of this half are fluctuations between pure *o*- (Lith. *a*) stems and pure *ā*-stems; this is by far the most common variation and may fairly be taken as representative of the others.

In the treatment of individual pairs of this type one author or another has assumed the one form as normal and the other as archaic or dialectic, depending upon the author's standpoint. Thus Kurschat (LDWb.) accompanies the (to him) familiar *tarbas* 'lederne Tasche, Bettelsack' with a *tarbà* which he places within brackets and designates as Polish-Lithuanian. Thus Leskien (Bildung der Nomina 179) cites an "*atsodas* . . . , wo jetzt fem. *atsoda*." Such examples could be multiplied indefinitely. Is the fluctuation between *o*- and *ā*-stems then a matter of dialect or of period? In individual words it may, of course, be either or both, but in general it is characteristic of the entire language; it has operated from the earliest times of which we have record; it is still operating; and there is no general tendency away from one stem to the other. Noun pairs of this sort are found in the same dictionary, in the same dialect (e. g. Godlewa *lazarëtä*: *lazareta* 'Lazaret' in Leskien-Brugmann, Litauische Volkslieder und Märchen, pp. 207, 268), in the same author (e. g., in Schleicher's Donaleitis, *porà* : *póras* 'Paar,' *smakrà* : *smákras* 'Kinn'), and even in the same poem (e. g. *manéra* : *manéras* 'Manier' in Rüdenio *gerybés*, ll. 490, 789).

Bezzenberger (Beiträge zur Geschichte der litauischen Sprache auf Grund litauischer Texte des XVI. und des XVII. Jahr-

hundreds, pp. 94 ff.) lists and classifies a large number of these fluctuations of all kinds (interchanges of *o*- and *ā*-stems are found on pages 96 and 97 as well as on 94 and 95), but the examples on those pages are all taken from Nesselmann. The latter only rarely indicates his sources, which are varied and for the most part written or printed. Nesselmann consequently offers little or no evidence as to period or dialect.

The dictionaries of Kurschat (Lithuanian-German) and Lalis (Lithuanian-English), on the other hand, are to a large extent products of personal experience with the language; the former is essentially Prussian-Lithuanian, the latter is based primarily on the speech of Kovno in the heart of Russian Lithuania; the latter was written a generation later than the former and is distinctly more modern. A comparison of the *o*- and *ā*-stems in the two dictionaries should therefore offer evidence as to whether the fluctuation between the two stem types is a matter of dialect or period.

The lists that follow include only nouns that are of one stem in one dictionary and of the other stem in the other dictionary. They are further restricted to words which do not appear in the above-mentioned lists of Bezzenger; thus my lists will serve as addenda to his. Unless otherwise indicated the word or words before the colon are from Kurschat; those after it are from Lalis.

1. *ā*-stems in Kurschat, *o*-stems in Lalis:

abejà : *abejas*; *adamoszka* : *adamoszkas*; *apsiuvà*, *apsiuvas* : *apsiuvas*; *atlaidà* : *atlaidas*, *atlaida*; *brika*, *brikas* : *brikas*; *burta* ‘Zauberei’ : *burtai*; *gyvatà* : *gyvatas*; *grivinà* : *grivinas*; *gvintà* : *gvintas*; *kánta* : *kantas*; *kasztà* : *kasztas*; *kaurà* : *kuras*; *kerplésza* : *kerplēszas*; *kraikà* : *kraikai*; *krijà* : *krijas*; *kriuszà*, *kruszà* ‘Hagel’ : *kriuszai*, *kriusza*, *krusza*; *ostà*, *óstas* ‘Mündung eines Flusses’ : *üstas* ‘haven, harbor, port’; *pamatà* : *pamatas*; *parédkà* ‘Form, Modell’ : *parédkas* ‘order, regulation’; *pažadà* : *pažadai*; *perlà* : *perlas*; *pr̄ézada* : *pr̄ežadas*; *prýzada* : *pryzadas*; *rauka*, *raūkas* : *raukas*; *rëma*, *rëmas* : *rëmai*; *rëszà* : *rëszas*; *rüczkà* : *ruczkas*; *salýkla*, *selýkla* : *salyklas*, *selyklas*; *sélvertà* : *sélvertas*; *serbentà* : *serbentas*; *skrìjos* : *skrijas*; *skundà* : *skundas*; *smakrà* : *smakras*; *svìrna* :

svirnas; szinkà : szinkas; trópta : troptas; údra : udras, udra; üsztësa : üztesas; valaka : valakas; vékà : vëkas; žegzdros : zëgždras.

2. *o*-stems in Kurschat, *ā*-stems in Lalis:

apgélaī : apgēlos; apýgardas : apygarda; āpmaudas : apmauda, apmaudas; atmatas : atmata; brindas : brinda; brōgas : broga; dūbai, dūbos : dubos; ıszdagas : iszdaga; iszvaizdas ‘Bild, Ebenbild’ : iszvaizda ‘appearance, look, aspect’; ītaikas ‘was jemand zu Gefallen geschieht’ : ītaika ‘pleasedness’; ītakas : ītaka; kalavijas : kalavija; kóksztas, kuksztas : kukszta, kúksztas; kvítas : kvita; (?) Nesselmann latákas ‘Wasserröhre, Wasserleitung,’ Kurschat latákas ‘zusammengelaufenes Wasser’: Lalis lataka ‘funnel, spile’; lazas : laza; lýras : lyra; liuřbas : liurba; lupinaī, lupinos : lupyna; lúmas : lúma, lúmas; medegas ‘Holz, Gehölz im Walde’ : medega ‘material, matter, substance’ (cf. Leskien Nomina 525); mēvas : mēva; mōrkas : morka; nārsas ‘mächtiger, gewaltiger Zorn’ (Nesselmann also ‘Eifer, Ernst’) : narsa ‘prowess’ (cf. Leskien Nomina 595); nēgandas, nēganda : neganda; notūras : notura; nūmas, nūmà : nūma; nūmaras : nūmara; nūtakas ‘Abhang’ : nūtaka; nūvalaī, nūvalos : nūvalos; pákraikas, pakráikos : pakraikos; párvas : parva; prāszmatas : praszmata; prēsas : preśa; sagas, sagà : saga; saladynai, saladynos : saladynos; skrándas : skranda; slyvas “bei Tilsit,” slyvà “in Südlitt.” : slyva; slogas ‘weight’ : sloga; spírgas : spirga; starostas, stórastas : starosta, storasta; stirtas, stirta : stirta; szépas, szépa : szépa; tāksas : taksa; uzlaś ‘der Estrich über dem Kamin,’ uzlaī ‘die kleinen Balken in der Scheune,’ užlos ‘was in der Klete (Vorratshäuschen) auf dem Boden ist’ : uzlos ‘loft, story, floor’; vanuszkai ‘Königskerze, Verbascum thapsus’ : vanuszka ‘foxglove, Digitalis purpurea’ (both plants belong to the family of the Scrophulariaceae); velkētas (cf. Kurschat LDWb. s. v. žirglës, DLWb. s. v. Schleife) : velketa (cf. Lalis ELDict. s. v. drag); voveruszkai : voveruszka.

The above lists show no marked tendency in the direction either of *o*- or of *ā*-stems; if the lists had not been restricted to examples not cited by Bezzenberger, the proportion between 1 and 2 would still be almost exactly as above. We may then conclude that the fluctuation between the two stem forms is not

a matter of period or dialect. That such fluctuations appeared in the oldest texts has been amply shown by Bezzenger (pp. 98 ff.). However, he apparently ignores (p. 102) the fact that the interchange between *o*- and *ā*-stems had its beginning in Indo-European (cf. Brugmann, Grundriss II, 1, 148 ff.). But the majority of such pairs of nouns cannot be traced as such beyond the Lithuanian, and Bezzenger's explanation is by no means without justification and application: that with the almost complete loss of the neuter in Lithuanian the distinctions of grammatical gender were weakened, and the noun stems that had been neuter became in part masculine, in part feminine, and in part masculine and feminine at the same time. Furthermore, the declensional boundary between *o*- and *ā*-stems was blurred by the fact that a number of inflectional case forms were essentially identical in the two declensions (cf. the acc., dat., gen., loc. in the sing. and the acc., dat., loc. in the plu.).

That these fluctuations are still common in the language, especially in connection with new words, is a matter of observation. Thus I have noticed in Lithuanian-American newspapers *paczta* for Lalis's *pacztas* 'post, post-office, mail'; and the word for 'industrial strike' appears almost indifferently as *streikas* and *streika*.

Substantival -ëna

To the feminine nouns in -ëna listed by Leskien (Bildung der Nomina, pp. 413, 414) may be added, from Lalis, the following:

1. Flesh, meat. *érëna* 'lamb's meat, lamb' : *éras* 'lamb'; *girëna* 'game, venison, deer' (a late analogical formation; cf. Kurschat *girënas* 'Waldbewohner') : *girë*, *gìria* 'forest'; *koszelëna* 'gelatin, jelly, hog's-headcheese' (new form in -ëna by analogy with the words for 'meat'; cf. *koszelëné* 'Sulze'; Kurschat s. v., Leskien Nomina 414) : to some derivative of *kóshti* 'to strain, filter'; *lapëna* 'fox meat' : *lápë* 'fox'; *merlëna* 'carcass, carrion' : *merlëna* (Kurschat); *pauksztëna* 'game' : *paúksztis* 'bird'; *stirnëna* 'venison' : *stírna* 'roe, deer'; *szvëžëna* 'fresh meat' (a new formation) : *szvëžias* 'fresh'; *zuikëna* 'hare meat' : *zuikis* 'hare.'

2. Field. *bulvëna* 'potato field' : *bulvë* (Lalis), *bulvis* (Kurschat) 'potato'; *vasarojëna* 'field from which the spring corn is removed; stubble field' : (Lalis) *vasarojus* 'spring corn,'

(Kurschat) *vasarójis*, *vasarójus* 'das Feld, auf welchem bei der Dreifelderwirtschaft das Sommergetreide wächst.'

3. No category. (?) *puréna* 'yellow water poppy.'

-ena in words for 'pelt'

-ena seems to have developed a slight degree of productivity in feminine noun stems denoting 'pelt,' but its productivity is restricted by its limited semantic scope. The suffix hangs closely together with the preceding -ena but, at least in Lalis, is not identical with it. Notice *ozena* 'Bocksfell,' *szunéna* 'Hundefell,' *vilkénà* 'Wolfschur' (Leskien Nomina 413, but Kurschat *vilkenà* 'Wolfspelz').

The following are from Lalis. *lapenos* 'fox fur' (cf. *lapéna* 'fox meat') : *lápè* 'fox'; *meszkenos* 'bearskin coat, bear's fur' (cf. *meszkénà* 'Bärenfleisch') : *meszkà* 'bear'; *oíkena* 'goat-skin, goat fur' (cf. *oíkëna* 'goat's meat, kid meat') : *oíka* (*oszkà*) 'goat'; *vilkena* 'wolf's skin, fur of wolves' (cf. *vilkénà* 'Wolfsfleisch') : *vílkas* 'wolf.' From this list is to be excluded *szarmenos* 'robe of ermine, ermine' : *szarmü* (*szarmen-*) 'ermine.'

HAROLD H. BENDER.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

V.—DESULTORY REMARKS ON LATIN PRO-NUNCIATION.

Have mere desultory remarks any claim to publication? Perhaps these may help some teacher whose only idea of advanced study is the pleasant sport of conjectural emendation and who therefore finds himself at a loss when a student demands of him a useful subject for research.

They are suggested by three books: Bridges' *Ibant Obscuri*, Clark's *Cursus in Vulgar Latin*, Hardie's *Res Metrica*. The Poet Laureate has made us all see, as we never saw before, the task of the Roman pioneers in quantitative metre. Livius knew instinctively the quantity of a Greek, the stress-accent of a Latin syllable. To write quantitative Greek and accentual Latin verse was easy for him. But quantitative Latin verse! There was the rub. If Roman literature had so thoroughly been captured as Horace avers by captured Greece, Greek rules of prosody would have been rigorously imposed, there and then, on Latin verse. But the earliest Roman poets were too independent to tolerate that. Hardie's brilliant chapter on the History of Metre at Rome shews us how long it was before Latin verse came to shew 'very little that the strictest Hellenist could call licence or irregularity.' And Clark's discovery that the clausula-rhythm in informal prose—Cicero's letters to Atticus, Petronius' novel—followed accent, not quantity, makes us think of a pronunciation like *dabunt*, *voluptatem*, *vidēs*, *nesciō*, and possibly of any and every unaccented syllable 'long by position,' as an utterance that required some conscious effort from an educated Roman. It was not wholly natural and instinctive to him, but something resembling, perhaps remotely, the artificial pronunciation in English verse of the noun 'wind' so as to rhyme with 'kind.' If Clark is right in saying that Cicero used a quantitative clausula in one letter, an accentual in another, one of Hardie's arguments against the accentual theory of Saturnians is weakened. Hardie finds it difficult to believe that *dabant malum* (followed by a consonant) could be treated by the same poet as *dabant málum* (in Saturnian verse) and as *dábunt málum* (in verse of the Greek pattern). 'Could the same material be treated so differently by the same poet at the same time?' But,

I confess, I should like to see this 'accentual clausula' of Cicero more fully treated. If the Oxford professor has not time to spare, will he find a lieutenant? For one cannot help feeling that the nature of the Latin accent, its restriction to the penult or the antepenultimate syllable, would give great opportunity to an appearance, a deceptive appearance, of a *cursus*. Sudhaus convinced himself that Plautus' *cantica* were dance-metres two steps forward and two steps backward—, because he could find in very many lines (and alas! tried to find in all) multiples of four *metra*. But he forgot¹ that the song-metres which literary tradition had transmitted to Plautus were usually tetrameters or dimeters, hardly ever trimeters. He never asked himself the question: What chance was there of non-observance of this supposed rule?

At any rate the introduction of the Greek type of metre was an innovation. Even Hardie, who finds in Saturnians quantitative metre, cannot find there the same kind of quantitative metre as the Greek. And his remark (apparently so obvious, yet never, I think, so convincingly put) that the Latin stress-accent gave an iambic rhythm which satisfied the Roman ear (not the Greek) to a line like:

labórans, quaérens, párcens, illi sérviens,

adds force to the statement (challenged by the Latin scholars of France) that Plautus and Terence paid some regard to accent as well as to quantity. 'The Latin accent,' says Hardie (p. 88) 'was not a strong enough stress to enable a short syllable to take the place of a long, but when two or three longs came together it differentiated them.' My 'Early Latin Verse' will, I hope, convince everyone that the admission of spondees to the second and fourth feet of the Senarius was, for a Roman, an improvement of the Greek form. It brought the verse of dialogue nearer the tone of talk without sacrificing anything essential. Also that the Law of Breves Breviantes is an imposing (and repellent) name for the characteristic slurred pronunciation of

¹ We have all said such hard things about Sudhaus' perverse defence of an impossible text (in his *Aetna*) and his Procrustean scansion of Plautus that I felt remorse when I learned lately from an obituary notice the difficulties of his life that drove him to over-hasty publication. And yet, it was not the man we censured, but his method.

everyday life at Rome. Our slurring takes the form of syncope: 'what's this?' 'I'd know'; the Roman shortened an unaccented syllable after a short syllable: *quid ēst hoc?* or *quid hōc est?*, *volō scire*. In Latin comedy (presumably even of the Augustan age) these colloquial pronunciations were naturally most in evidence, though some of them had so thoroughly driven the literary pronunciation off the field that they get Virgil's sanction: *vidēn ut geminae stent vertice cristae*. (No syllable should by rule be longer than *dēs + n.*) It is not true to say that Ennius admitted to his epic no shortening but of a final vowel. We find *enīm r-* in one extant line:

non enim rumores ponebāt ante salutem,

and I fancy there were plenty of examples like this (and possibly like *apūd Cumas*) in the lines that are not extant. That a comedian, above all a jolly soul like Plautus, would allow bizarre artificial pronunciations of words or phrases to pervade his plays is so impossible that I have always thought it a waste of time to collect proof that his *quid ēst hoc*, his *volūptatem*, Terence's *ex Graecis bonīs*, echoed actual everyday utterance. Some Plautine scholars insist that, if *bonīs* in this sentence (where the word has sarcastic emphasis) were pronounced *bonīs*, it must have been always a pyrrhic, that *volūptatem* in Virgil proves the unreality of *volūptatem* in Plautus. But that is the same as to assert that 'what is this?' in Milton proves the unreality of 'what's this?' in Shakespeare. Is it worth arguing with people who assert such things? The only suitable argument is banter. One should not hurt people's feelings, but I cannot refrain from quoting this sentence from an Irish journal. It is so deliciously Irish: 'Perhaps then to an ancient poet [I think he means Plautus] it may have been a boon to strip a word at once of its work-a-day air by chanting it to another and a stranger cadence.'

What theory do my critics (at least in Germany) prefer to mine? They maintain that the shortening is due to the ictus of the line. *Ex Graecis bonīs* is the result of the short syllable *bo* being 'under the ictus.' In other words, Terence wrote down the sentence (not verse): *ex Graecis bonīs Latinas fecit non bonas*, and found that an ictus fell on the short syllable *bo-*. That satisfied him; the line would scan; for *bonīs* would in these circumstances become *bonīs*. (Presumably if the ictus

had 'happened' to fall on *La-*, the fourth word would have become *Latīnas!*) To them the difference between *ad istam vallem*, *ad illam vallem* on the one hand, and *ad istam vallem*, *ad illam vallem* on the other, is that *ad* stands 'under the ictus' in the first type, but not in the second. To me the difference is that the pronoun is a sentence-enclitic in the first. And here is a subject for a dissertation: Collect all examples of *ille*, *iste* after a short preposition or pronoun in the dialogue of Plautus and Terence and see whether there is a single example of shortening when *ille*, *iste* has any emphasis (e. g. 'to that valley, but not to this'). In a phrase like *ad illam vallem* both *ad* and *illam* would usually be sentence-enclitics (the first of the pair taking a secondary accent). Plautus' *ad illam vallem* reappears in the Romance languages (Ital. *alla valle*) and was presumably the natural pronunciation for a Roman at all times.

It is unlucky that Commodian's poems have been preserved in one manuscript only, a Verona transcript, I think (now in two parts), of a volume that passed from Cassiodore's library at Vivarium to Bobbio. Still it is in transcripts from an exemplar in unfamiliar minuscule that there is most likelihood of error, and probably the traditional text is sound enough. Here too there is opportunity for useful research. Examine Commodian's rude hexameter in the light of Plautine scansion on the one hand and of Romance philology on the other. Is it a faithful reflection of the unconventional Latin of the time or did Commodian '*ut versum faceret*' (to quote Cicero's phrase) do violence to the language, in his re-action against the artificial rules of the 'correct' poets who wrote for the educated classes?

Hardie speaks (p. 217) of the 'high degree of . . . artificiality' in the *novi poetae*. One usage of Catullus on which I should like to see a dissertation is the Greek usage of lengthening a final short vowel before an initial consonant group. Even if there were a certain example in previous Latin poetry I would still call it a Greek usage, but the isolation of Ennius' *stabilitā scamna* (Ann. 96), in contrast with the persistent short scansion by all the old poets, makes one doubt the reading. Certainly every one will allow that Catullus' *impotentia freta* is quite Greek and un-Roman, even if opinions differ about his *nullā spes*. Was it Catullus (and his friends) who first imposed this Greek prosody on Roman verse? And do the other great poets bind

themselves to the Greek chariot wheel in his slavish fashion? Will not some one sift out the 'Greek' licences of Virgil (e. g. *Actaeō Aracintho*) from the genuine Roman usages (e. g. *an quī amant*)? No doubt, there are already books and articles and lists of statistics, but no intelligent treatment (so far as I know) of the gradual invasion of Roman poetry by Greek prosody, the traitors who admitted the alien, the patriots who repelled him.

Finally, a remark so desultory as to over-leap the scope of this paper. Will not some one undertake a full history of the *novi poetae*, of that wonderful transformation of Roman poetry by a professor and his pupils, that Celtic (yes, Celtic) movement that prepared a way for Virgil? Valerius Cato's *Lydia* and *Dirae* (the first Roman imitations of Theocritus) the *Ciris* (by Gallus or by Virgil and Gallus), the *Culex* (young Virgil's fairy-tale to amuse a very youthful prince) and the poems of Virgil's student days, all would claim a place.

W. M. LINDSAY.

ST. ANDREW'S, SCOTLAND.

V.—CONTRIBUTIONS TO LATE LATIN LEXICOGRAPHY.¹

absentor: ab adspectibus hominum -ari RUF. *Clem.* 10. 66. *abscisio*: nec . . . patitur (anima) . . . -em aut coniunctionem RUF. *Clem.* 3. 4. *accipiter* = homo rapiens: istum humani corporis -em AMBR. *Tob.* 7. 25. *adeptio*: -e bonorum defraudari AMBR. *Hel.* 18. 68. *adhinnio*: equi -entes AMBR. *in Ps.* 118. 4. 8; fiunt ex hominibus equi -entes *Hel.* 16. 59; nolite amare -entes *Nab.* 15. 65. *adleuamentum*: ieunium est infirmitatis -um AMBR. *Hel.* 8. 22. *agellulus*: exturbare . . . -o suo pauperem AMBR. *Nab.* 1. 1. *annosus*: s. u. *Thes.* II. 114. 33 for ‘annosissimus AUG. Ep. 3. 3.’ read ‘AUG. Ep. 137. 3.’ (Ep. 3 became Ep. 137 in the Benedictine edition of AUG. (circa 1696). It looks as though the Edd. of the *Thes.* had taken this ref. from previous lexica without any attempt at verification.) *apicula*: -am AUG. *c. Acad.* 1. 7. 20; -a *Ep.* 15 (*fin.*). *apocatasticus*: quia tempora tua malitiosus suscepit Mars aut Saturnus, aut aliquis eorum -us fuit RUF. *Clem.* 10. 11. *apophoretum*: s. u. *Thes.* II. 1147. 35 for ‘relationis’ read ‘uelationis.’ *appetentia*: s. u. *Thes.* II. 279. 84 for ‘AMBR. 1. 9. 91.’ read ‘AMBR. *de Abrah.* 1. 9. 91.’ ut illaquearet -am corporalem AMBR. *Hel.* 1. 1; quanto audior -a, tanto esca iucundior 9. 32. *auctionator*: frumenti -or AMBR. *Nab.* 5. 22. *auicula*: AUG. *de uer. relig.* 87; *c. Acad.* 3. 4. 7; *de Magist.* 10. 32; *c. Faust.* 32. 13. *aula* = uterus: In this sense ‘aula’ is not always used of the ‘uterus Virginis Mariae,’ as the *Thes.* says II. 1459. 27; e. g. nisi in locum suum illa recipiendorum seminum -a reuocetur, uitam consuevit excludere AMBR. *in Ps.* 118, *Serm.* 19. 1.

captura: in -a piscium positus RUF. *Clem.* 2. 62; = ‘a

[¹The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (London, England) has committed to the author of these Contributions the preparation of a Dictionary of Later Latin, the aim of which will be to cover ‘with fulness and precision the whole period from Suetonius to Bede.’ These first-fruits are intended as corrections and additions to the *Thesaurus* and other lexica, but considerations of space have rendered it impossible to print the full context of the illustrative passages.—ED.]

catch' consueta officii uotum -a fefellit PAUL. PETRICORD. *Vit. Mart.* V (CSEL, Vol. 16; line 656); captura fefellit *ibid.* l. 671. *cauma:* tum fontes gelido moderentes caumata potu DREP. FLOR. *Hymn. Ananiae* (Migne PL. LXI. 1086 A). *com paginatio:* -e stellarum homines aut homicidae aut adulteri flunt RUF. *Clem.* 9. 16. *compellatio:* hac -e turbatior AUG. c. *Acad.* 2. 7. 16. *cudo:* -is argentum AMBR. *Tob.* 14. 50.

deductor: s. u. *Thes.* V. 284. 2 for 'AUG. Ep. 4. 6. 1.' read 'AUG. Ep. 46. 1.' *defluxio:* nec . . . patitur (anima) . . . influxionem aut -em RUF. *Clem.* 3. 4. *disproficio:* hebetudine haeretica -is HIL. *Trin.* 10. 33. (Quillacq, *Quomodo lat. lingua usus sit S. Hilarius*, p. 46, gives only *Trin.* 11. 11—which example was pointed out also by E. W. Watson in JP XXVIII. 84.)

eradicabilis: omne (uerbum) quod non fructuosum, periculosum atque -e AMBR. *in Ps.* 38. 5. *esus:* alia ergo -i, alia alii nascuntur usui AMBR. *Hex.* 3. 9. 39. *esox* (*ἴσοξ*): in nexum . . . traxit | congaudens -em PAUL. PETRICORD. *Vit. Mart.* V, line 676. *exagitatio:* ipsi sibi sunt propriae -is auctores AMBR. *Nab.* 14. 62.

immediatus: quid sit omnium primum, quidue -um . . . docendum est RUF. *Clem.* 1. 20. *inaquosus:* usually = ἄνυδρος (e. g. arida et inaquosa loca HIL. *in Matt.* 12. 21) (cf. Rönsch, *It. und Vulg.* pp. 125, 225), but = ἔνυδρος in RUF. *Clem.* 3. 3 terrestria et -a et uolatilia animalia. *incompellabilis:* ἀκατονόμαστον, id est, -e RUF. *Clem.* 8. 15. *incolatus:* ad tertii -us demonstrationem HIL. *in Ps.* 2. 32; demutatione -us . . . ignobiles *in Ps.* 51. 19. (Quillacq, op. cit. p. 24, gives only *in Ps.* 118. 4. 1.) Cf. Archiv für lat. Lexic. VIII, p. 239; Mayor's TERTULLIAN *Apol.* Index s. u. *indesecabilis:* -is naturae portionem deseca HIL. *Trin.* 10. 34. (Quillacq, p. 36, gives only *Trin.* 5. 8.) *indeuotus:* -us uideri AMBR. *Abrah.* 2. 7. 40. *indigestio:* indigestio cibi AMBR. *Hel.* 11. 38. *indubitabilis:* -em fidem RUF. *Clem.* 1. 25; cf. 3. 41 fidem -em. *inferax:* inutiles atque -es siluae HIL. *Trin.* 9. 55 (med.) (not in Quillacq). *informitas:* forma et informitas . . . ex -e uel deformitate RUF. *Clem.* 8. 54. *infusio:* -e diluui purgare terram AMBR. *Abrah.* 2. 1. 1; -em . . . diuinæ praesentiae Isaac 3. 8; Spiritus Sancti -em *Abrah.* 2. 8. 48; *Ep.*

80. 2; pluuiarum -e dissolui SALV. *Gub.* 3. 1. 1. *inintelligentia*: inscrutabilium iudiciorum . . . -am HIL. *Trin.* 8. 38 (*ad fin.*); -am 10. 30. (Quillacq has no ex. of this word.) *ininitiabilis*: ad unum -em . . . uniuersa referimus HIL. *de Synod.* 26. 59; ex -is intelligentiae natuitate *Trin.* 9. 57. (Q., p. 36, gives only *in Ps.* 63. 5; Watson in JP XXVIII. 85 adds *in Ps.* 118, *Koph.* 9. *ininuestigabilis*: causas -ium sacramentorum tractare HIL. *Trin.* 10. 70. *innascibilitas*: Christus . . . ex -e Deus uerus est HIL. *Trin.* 9. 31; 9. 57 (*bis*); *de Synod.* 26; 47 etc. (Q., p. 19, gives only *de Synod.* 60.) *inobseruans*: -is et perfidi . . . contagium AMBR. *Isaac* 3. 6. *inuestigabilis* = unsearchable: quis hanc ualeat altitudinem -em inuestigare et inscrutabilem perscrutari? EUGIPP. *Thes.* XX. 35 (= AUG. *C. D.* 12. 14).

lacto: future partic. exceptionally rare. (*tigris*) quasi -tura foetus residet AMBR. *Hex.* 6. 4. 21. *lator*: epistolae (for the more usual 'perlator') AUG. *Ep.* 45. 2. *ligneolus*: -is canaliibus AUG. *de Ord.* 1. 4. 11. *litterio*: -es AUG. *Ep.* 118. 4. 26.

metallicus (nouo sensu): (episcopos) in ecclesiasticis frontibus scriptos -ae damnationis titulo HIL. *c. Constant.* 11 (not given by Quillacq). *militariter*: AUG. *Ep.* 118. 4. 26.

peridrome: matricis AMBR. *in Ps.* 118. 19. 1. *pincerna*: -ae AMBR. *Hel.* 8. 25; -arum 13. 48. *proeliator*: -es AMBR. *Hel.* 13. 50; -em *in Ps.* 118. 18. 24. *profanus* (superl.): HIL. *c. Const.* 12 (not given by Q.). *promuscis*: -e haurire aquae plurimum AMBR. *Hel.* 17. 65; replere concavum -is *ibid.* *protensio*: -e HIL. *Trin.* 9. 37; -em 6. 17. (Q., p. 18, gives only *Trin.* 5. 37.) *prouisor*: -e RUF. *Clem.* 8. 15; -em rerum 10. 50. *punctio*: -es facinorum AUG. *in Ps.* 74. 9 (*post med.*). *purpurasco*: -entem . . . colorem AMBR. *Hex.* 3. 5. 21.

quadrifidus: fculneae . . . folium . . . -a interscinditur diuisione AMBR. *Hex.* 3. 14. 60.

retrocessim: si tam uberis in praeteritos sanctificatio uelut *retrocessim* missa concendit quam affluens in uenturos *antecessim* [sic Ed., recte; codd. autem 'amicos' *praebent*] (si dici potest) declinauit atque defluxit PACIAN. *Traité inéd.* in Morin, *Anec. Mared.* II. 1 (Etudes, Textes et Découvertes), p. 134. 15 ff.

subconnúmero: Spiritus Sanctus . . . -atur . . . Patri et Fi-

lio RUF. *Clem.* 3. 11. *substitutio*: elementorum diuersas -es HIL. *Trin.* 9. 31. (Q., p. 23, gives only *Trin.* 1. 16.) *subticeo* (subticesco?): -uit aliquantum AUG. *de Ord.* 1. 3. 9 (*init.*). *supersapio*: -ere HIL. *Trin.* 10. 53 (*med.*). (Q., p. 45, gives only *de Synod.* 6.)

testimonialiter: VIGIL. THAPS. (?) *contra Mariuad.* praef. *trituratorius*: area -a (Publicola in) AUG. *Ep.* 46 (*med.*).

uermiculatus: -um paumentum AUG. *de Ord.* 1. 1. 2. *uiο*: -antes AMBR. *Tob.* 1. 5.; -antes incognitam carpentes uiam Abrah. 2. 2. 6. *umbo* (nouo sensu): praetumidae -ibus capillorum AUG. *de Sanct. Virg.* 34 (*ante med.*). *usurpator*: quasi improbus -or concidit ianuas AMBR. *Nab.* 14. 62. S. u. *usurpatrix* in Lewis & Short, for 'Salv. Gub. 3. 12' read 'Salv. Gub. 4. 12. 56.'

J. H. BAXTER.

KING'S COLLEGE,
ABERDEEN, MAY, 1919.

REPORTS.

HERMES LV (1920), 1 and 2.

Zu den Kaiserreskripten (1-42). U. Wilcken attempts, in the face of divergent views, by means of "observations and hypotheses," to clarify our understanding of the form and method of issuance of the imperial rescripts, which Mommsen's publication of the inscription of Skaptopara, discovered 1868, has made especially interesting (Mom. Jurist. Schr. 2. Bd. pp. 172 f.). Wilcken distinguishes sharply between the rescript (or subscriptio), made in response to a libellus of a petitioner, and the epistula. The rescript (or subscriptio) was made on a space provided on the libellus, beginning with a formal pre-script; viz., Imp. Caes. T. Aelius etc. Sextilio Acutiano (without the salutatio of the epistula). Thereupon followed the subscriptio, executed by an official *a libellis*, and finally, when the accuracy of the subscriptio had been vouched for with the *Recognovi* of the chief of the chancery, the emperor wrote his *Scripsi* (or *Rescripsi*), and affixed his seal (Suet. Aug. 50), omitting the *vale* of the epistula. Moreover, from the time of Hadrian, with the cessation of the magisterial edicts, the channels through which the libellus with appended subscriptio reached the petitioner became more complex. For now the propositio was introduced, a custom that can be traced for a century. During this period a certain number of such documents were joined in the order of their accession to form a roll, which was then exposed at Rome (eventually also at Alexandria), from which the petitioners were obliged to obtain certified copies. These temporarily exposed rolls were then returned to the archives, where they were pasted on to those previously exposed during the current quarter of the year. The several petitions could be traced with the aid of paging and serial numbers. The local publications on stone, like that of Skaptopara, were made from the copies of the petitioners. They show a number of arbitrary omissions, which with the fragmentary state of the inscriptions and papyri have made it difficult to understand numerous points of juridical and historical importance which W. discusses.

Zu den Persern des Aischylos (43-62). K. Münscher discusses the meter of vv. 93 ff., 532 ff., 674 ff. and offers some emendations of the text of U. von Wilamowitz.

Ein neues Bruchstück des Diagoras von Melos (63-67).† B. Keil discovered in an unedited scholion of Vatic. graec. 1298

to an oration of Aristides a seventh version of the anecdote that Diogenes had on a certain occasion used a wooden statue of Heracles to cook a dish of lentils. The closing sentence is metrical: <*πρὸς*> δώδεκα τοῖσιν ἀθλοῖς || τρισκαιδέκατον τόνδ' ἐτέλεσ(σ)εν Ἡρακλῆς δίος. Keil argues that these words, which he accepts as a new fragment of the poetry of Diagoras, suggested to someone in the II century A. D. the invention of the above anecdote to illustrate the supposed atheism of Diagoras. The relation of the other inferior versions to this one is shown.

Das philosophiegeschichtliche Compendium des Areios Didymos (68-98). E. Howald extends his source-analysis of Diogenes Laertius (Philologus N. F. XXVIII (1917) pp. 119 f.) to show that a compendium of lives of philosophers and their views, which he calls A, originated with the Callimachean Hermippus; but was remodelled, receiving numerous later additions. As no citation is later than the beginning of the Christian era, its author may have been Areius Didymus, the teacher of Augustus. The Theophrastean tradition in it was preserved better than in Aetius. Howald traces at length its influence in Hippolytus, Clemens of Alex., Eusebius, etc.

Miscellen: F. Bechtel (99-100) derives the name of the Athenian Σμόκορδος from *σμοκορδοῦν*, which was expanded by an hypocoristic κ-element from *σμορδοῦν*, as ἀσπακάζομαι was from ἀσπάζομαι (cf. Hesychius). He cites the Spartan names Ἀλεξάκων, Ἀπελλάκων etc.—E. Meyer (100-102) derives the πύργος that Preisigke describes as a massive industrial building, (A.J.P. XLI pp. 387 f.) from a primitive tower (Hebrew ‘migdal’), such as is mentioned in Isaiah 5, 1 f.; Mark 12, 1, etc. See the illustration in Robert, Sarkoph. Rel. III 3, 436; compare also the τετραπυργία in A.J.A. XVI p. 77.—K. Praechter (102-104) emends Plot. Ennead. VI 1, 11 (Müller p. 243, 14 f.) τὸ δὲ τραχὺ καὶ τὸ λεῖον καὶ τὸ ἀραιὸν καὶ τὸ πυκνὸν ὄρθως ἢν λέγοιτο ποιά (omitting οὐκ) in opposition to Aristotle Categ. 8 f., who classified the rough, dense, etc., as cases of θέσις and πρός τι. The close of the Plotinian passage should read: εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐκ τούτων, οὐδὲν κωλύει καὶ ὡς (not ὡς) ποιὰ εἶναι.—P. Groebe (105-107) shows that Cicero wrote his Brutus between Dec. 1, 47 and Feb. 1, 46 and the Paradoxa betw. 2-21 Feb. 46 (corrected calendar).—M. Leumann (107-111) cites passages illustrating the semasiology of fustis. From its use in the army, originally in the hands of the general, it became an instrument for judicial punishment, so that in addition to the earlier virgis caedere, the law books show fustibus caedere, castigare, verberare. The German ‘Prügel kriegen’ is a translation of fustes accipere. A gradation from the admonitio per verba to the fine, the virgæ, fustes, flagella, and vincula can be

noted.—O. Weinreich (111-112) explains the difficult genitive *interfectae virginitatis* in Apuleius *Metam.* V 4 as a 'Genetiv des Sachbetreffs,' which has been frequently discussed in recent years.

Zum griechischen Bankwesen der klassischen Zeit (113-173). J. Hasebroek, encouraged by the light thrown on Roman and Hellenistic banking methods by the Egyptian papyri (cf. Preissige, *Girowesen im griechischen Aegypten*, 1910), endeavors through a critical examination of selected passages from Demosthenes, Isocrates etc., combined with historical and economical considerations, and references to medieval and modern practice, to obtain a better understanding of the Greek banking system during the classical period. The money changer had developed into a coin expert, a medium for making payments, a trusted custodian of money, as well as of other valuables, and finally a dealer in credits, in short a banker, who in time left money-changing to the simple money-changer. In general the transactions were verbal, even in the time of Plautus. Payments on written orders, or by means of *σύμβολα* were comparatively rare. A higher development of a system of checks or bills of exchange has been assumed for the classical period than is justified. Interstate commerce was restricted by numerous handicaps. There was no system of international credit; branch banks did not exist. Foreign bills of exchange cannot be assumed even for Roman times. Cicero's money-orders bear some resemblance, but do not prove the existence of the bill of exchange, which was a creation of the outgoing middle ages. International payments were usually made by shipments of coin, and to a certain extent by loans on bottomry. An exchange of accounts is recorded in Isocr. Trap. 35. Even the local banking business was chiefly verbal, and usually in the presence of witnesses, although fear of the unlimited power of the state induced many to make their deposits without witnesses, trusting to the integrity of the bankers. A distinction must be made between deposits for interest and drawing accounts which facilitated payments. The check system, however, was still in the elementary stages. Besides doing a credit business bankers also engaged in industrial and commercial enterprises. The details given are illuminating and the literature cited especially valuable.

Zwei Hydrophoren (174-187). E. Preuner discusses a forgotten inscription from Didyma, published by Ussing 1854, which honors a hydrophoros of Artemis Pytheie, named Lenis, during whose term of office, it is stated, Miletus recovered her autonomy. It is dated with the names of the annual prophet (name illegible), and stephanophoros (*Hēgemandros* son of Nicomachus) whose year (38/7 b. c.) can now be determined by the lists of Mile-

sian stephanophori. That the recovery of the autonomy of Miletus is also mentioned under the name of the preceding stephanophorus can easily be harmonized. A third inscription tells of a prophet (year of office unknown) who had negotiated the freedom of Miletus at Rome, and ten years earlier had obtained ivory for the temple at Didyma from Ptolemy XIV. These various officials were frequently members of the same family, and a stephanophorus could later obtain the office of prophet. P. also discusses an epigram of the II century of our era, (Dittenb. Syll.² 785) in which another hydrophorus is honored. This was Vera (*Bῆρα*), the daughter of the physician Glaucias, who was called from Argos to the office of hydrophorus of the Patmian Artemis, which is significant as Patmos was one of the several localities that claimed to have received the statue of the Taurian Artemis.

Aus einer Apollon-Aretalogie (188-195). W. Schubart publishes with emendations and notes the Greek papyrus P. 11517, which is fragmentary in the first and third of its three columns. Written in the second century of our era, it represents in dramatic form a sacrilegious attack on the holy precinct of Delphi. The leader, Daulis, threatens the life of the prophet and denounces the Delphic oracles as impostures. The prophet seeks refuge at the hearth of the perpetual fire, remonstrates with Daulis and finally invokes the god Apollo and threatens the atheist with the Erinyes. Schubart gives a tentative analysis and thinks it probable that the conclusion told of a miraculous rescue by Apollo; hence the document may be classed as an aretalogy of Apollo, a form of literature of which little is known.

Die Handschrift C von Justins Epitome (196-203). A. Mentz assumes that codex C was indirectly derived from a carelessly written stenographic archetype, which would explain certain arbitrary variants. For example in Justinus XXIV 8, 11 C has s e, which can be represented by a nota that is similar to the one designating vitam, the reading of the other MSS, but simpler; and as errors in copying a stenographic MS would naturally be made by substituting the simpler for the more complex sign, Mentz rejects the reading of C, and concludes from this, and other such tests, that henceforth C may be neglected, and suggests a wider use of his hypothesis.

Die Schriftenverzeichnisse des Aristoteles und des Theophrastus (204-221). C. Howald continues his investigation of the philosophical handbooks (see Howald above), and especially discusses the edition of Aristotle's works by Andronicus of Rhodes, on which the questionable library of Apellicon had no influence.

Miscellen: W. Otto (222-224) takes the *χρηματιστικὸς πυλών*

in Polyb. XV 31, 2 to mean a wing of the palace. The papyri show that the *πυλών* of private houses contained both living- and store-rooms. The Greek translation of the book of Esther renders the 'king's gate' in 4, 2 with *πύλη τοῦ βασιλέως*, elsewhere with *αὐλῆ*. Josephus renders the same in his paraphrase partly with *βασίλεια*, partly with *αὐλῆ*. Otto cites also *αἱ βασιλέως θύραι* in Xen. Anab. I 9, 3 etc.; *οἱ ἐπὶ θύραις* in Plut. Them. 29 etc. This oriental use of 'portal' and 'gates' to mean the palace itself can be traced down to modern times (cf. The Sublime Porte).—F. Bechtel (224) thinks the name *Τραγεύρινα* was given to a certain locality in Arcadia (Mnemos. 42. 329 f.) from its resemblance to a goatskin, as *τραγεύρινος* would mean one who wears a goatskin.

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, LXXIII, 1 and 2.

Pp. 1-34. Bernhard Laum, Alexandrinisches und byzantinisches Akzentuationssystem. The object of this paper is to show how the Byzantine system of Greek written accent, which is identical with that of our present printed texts, developed from the original, or Alexandrian system. With a view to the restoration of the Alexandrian system, Laum examines first the theoretical treatises of the Alexandrian grammarians and, in particular, the doctrines of Herodian as contained in the *'Ιλιακή* and *'Οδυσσειακή προσῳδία*, since most of the accented papyri fall in the time of Herodian. The following rules are established by Laum for the Alexandrian accent of words in the interior of the sentence: 1. All monosyllabic oxytones are barytone, that is, have the grave accent. 2. All dissyllabic and polysyllabic oxytones have the acute. Before enclitics and marks of punctuation they are likewise oxytone. 3. The dissyllabic prepositions retain their acute; only in cases where the following word has either acute or circumflex on the first syllable, does the acute change to grave. In particular cases, the acute is retained even under the latter circumstances (e. g. *περί* = *περισσῶς*). 4. Oxytone pronouns retain their acute if they are orthotone. After a comparison of the grammatical theory with the practice in the papyri, it is found that, although the preceding rules are adhered to, there is sometimes a variation in the writing of the accent. A grave on the penult, or on both penult and antepenult, may denote an acute on the ultima. In the papyri the accent, when acute or grave, stands over the first vowel of the diphthong; when

circumflex, it extends from the first vowel to the second. The Byzantine system grew out of the Alexandrian. From the time of Aristarchus the number of accented texts increased until the second and third centuries. In the third century the Alexandrian system began to decay. Large numbers of accented texts were produced in this period, and quality yielded to quantity. The grave accent showed a tendency to pass over farther to the right, due to increased speed in writing. The accent on diphthongs was shifted to the second vowel. The papyri, as examined by Laum, show this as a gradual development. Finally, about the fourth century there came a complete breakdown, and the confusion reached its maximum. The new system was not based on the theories of Herodian, but was built up from the accented texts. In these, dissyllabic oxytones had come to have the grave on the ultima and, as they appeared in much greater numbers than the polysyllabic oxytones that had the grave on one or more of the preceding syllables as well, the usage in the case of the dissyllables became the standard, and the polysyllables dropped the graves from all but the final syllable. The texts of the fifth century show that the new system came at once into full authority.

Pp. 35-45. E. Ritterling, *Zur Zeitbestimmung einiger Urkunden vom Opramoas-Denkmal*. An attempt to supplement the chronology of R. Heberdey (*Opramoas, Inschriften vom Heeroon zu Rhodiapolis*, Wien, 1897) with regard to the monument of Opramoas in the Lycian city of Rhodiapolis. The monument contains decrees of the federation of Lycian cities and letters from provincial governors and from the Emperor, Antoninus Pius. Ritterling deals, for the most part, with the chronology of the various documents and with that of the provincial governors. Opramoas was born probably before the year 86. In document No. 13 (Heberdey), the *ἐπάνοδος* is not the journey of the Emperor Hadrian in the year 129 or 130, as Heberdey thinks, but the return of Trajan to Italy in 117, due to the illness that forced him to abandon his campaign in Mesopotamia.

Pp. 46-58. G. Helmreich, *Zum sogenannten Aurelius de acutis passionibus*. The text of Aurelius in the Brussels MS, from which it was published by Daremburg in 1847 (Janus, II 468-499; 690-731), is handed down in a very incomplete state. However, Gariopontus has incorporated the whole of Aurelius, with the exception of chapters 8 and 17, in his compilation, and seems to have used a MS better than the Brussels. Daremburg did not recognize this. Helmreich compares the readings of Aurelius with those of Gariopontus, and in many cases an im-

proved text is the result. Nearly two hundred readings are compared and discussed.

Pp. 59-83. Wilhelm Bannier, Zu griechischen und lateinischen Autoren (II). Notes, partly textual, partly interpretative, on: 1. Aleman's Partheneion, Anth. Lyr. 5, 45 ff. 2. A fragment of Cratinus (Meineke, II 61; Kock, I 35). 3. Thuc. III 12, 3. 4. Horace, Sat. I 6, 125 f. 5. Ovid, Fast. II 203 and 204. 6. Ovid, A. A. I 331 ff. 7. Manilius, I 382 ff. 8, 9, and 10. Seneca, Troad. 8 ff.; 301 ff.; and 988 ff.

Pp. 84-101. Otto Seeck. Libanius gegen Lucianus. A commentary on Libanius, Orat. LVI (Contra Lucianum) dealing, for the most part, with the chronology of the oration and that of the life of Lucianus. The speech was composed between the summer of 388 and that of 391, and not between 389 and 392 (Forster). Seeck thinks it very probable that the Lucianus of Libanius and the one mentioned by Zosimus (V 2) are the same. If so, the death of Lucianus occurred in the summer of 393.

Pp. 102-123. T. O. Achelis, Die fabel Doligami. The identity of the Doligami (gen.) mentioned in the preface of Steinhöwel's *Æsop* and in a few other German editions has hitherto remained unknown. The variants *Doligani* and *Doligiani* also occur. By a consideration of the Latin fabulistic poets known at the time whom Steinhöwel could have used for his collection, Achelis comes to the conclusion that Doligamus must be Angelo Poliziano. Steinhöwel probably wrote POLITIANI. POLITIANI was first corrupted to DÖLIGANI, later to DOLIGAMI.

Pp. 124-126. Miszellen. Conrad Cichorius, Mancia. Cichorius thinks *manciola* 'Händchen' (Laevius in Gellius, XIX 7, 10) is a diminutive of an unattested word *mancia* and not an assimilation to *brachiolum* (cf. Meyer-Lübke, Rhein. Mus. LXXII 153 ff.). *Mancia* does appear as a proper name, and designations of the parts of the body are frequently used as cognomina (e. g. *barba*, *coxa*, etc.). Thus there may have been a vulgar Latin word *mancia*. On the other hand, *brachiolum*, which, in the meaning 'Ärmchen,' occurs only once in Latin literature (according to the Thesaurus), and that in Catullus (61, 181), may best be regarded as an imitation of Laevius' *manciola*, since Catullus was strongly influenced by Laevius.

Pp. 126-128. A. Brinkmann, Lückebüsser, 29. In Plato's Symposium, 195A and B, Brinkmann thinks Plato probably wrote: *μετὰ δὲ νέων δεὶξύεστι τε καὶ <ἔστι τοιοῦτος οἰδησπερ(οἴσπερ) δεὶξίν>εστιν.*

Pp. 129-136. P. E. Sonnenburg, De Catulli phaselo. The

fourth poem of Catullus has nothing to do with any personal experience or voyage of the poet, according to Sonnenburg. The poem is evidently written in accordance with a convention somewhat similar to that of the votive epigrams of the sixth book of the Anthologia Palatina. But Catullus has not made the master of the *phaselus* or the *phaselus* itself the speaker, but has introduced a third person recounting to the hospites of v. 1 the story of the *phaselus* in its own words. That is, he seems to explain to the *hospites* an inscription on a votive offering and written in the first person. The man who is speaking resembles a guide or a *mystagogus*, one of a class which was accustomed to exhibit and explain to strangers the wonders of cities and temples. The strange diction is used in order to display the *vanitas* of this man.

Pp. 137-160. H. Schöne, Verschiedenes. Notes, mainly textual, and discussion of: 1. Various passages from Greek authors of which there has reached us a twofold version, and an emendation of Quintilian, VIII 6, 64. 2. Fragment of Antiphon, *περὶ ἀληθείας* (Oxyrh. Pap. XI 1364; Diels, Berl. Sitz.-Ber., 1916, p. 932). 3. Scholium on *θεῖον* in Hippocrates, *περὶ ἱερῆς νούσου*, chap. 1 (in Klein's Erotian p. 7, 13 ff.; in Nachmanson's edition p. 108, 10 ff.). 4. Hippocrates, *περὶ ἀέρων ιδάτων τόπων*, chap. 12 (I 54 Kühlewein). 5. Plato, Parmenides 127C2. 6. Note on the direct *ἔφη* where one would expect *φάναι* or *εἰπεῖν* in the Parmenides. 7. Extract from Plato's Laws from Pap. Berol. 9766 (Diels, Berliner Klassikertexte, II 54, 14 ff.). 8. Anonymous commentator on Plato's Theaetetus (Berliner Klassikertexte, Heft 2, Kol. 14, 6 ff.). 9. Title of Galen's Protrepticus in the editio princeps, the Aldine of 1525. 10. Galen's Protrepticus, 34; 10, 31 ff.; and 12, 28 ff. 11. Galen, Protrepticus, chap. 12, p. 18, 20 ff. Kaibel. 12. Nemesius, p. 206 Jäger. 13. Galen, *περὶ τοῦ προγιγνώσκειν*, 14 (XIV 627 K.). 14. Apollodorus, *πολιορκητικά* (p. 145, 1 Wescher; p. 14 Schneider).

Pp. 161-173. Paul Cauer, Terminologisches zu Platon und Aristoteles. Detailed discussion of the origin and development of the technical terms *μύησις* and *ὅπος* in Plato and Aristotle.

Pp. 174-198. Karl Münscher, Kritisches zum Panegyrikus des jüngeren Plinius. Detailed discussion of the text of the first eight chapters together with remarks on rhythmical clausulae in Pliny and a consideration of the question whether chapter 7 shows the effects of Pliny's recension before publication. The latter question is answered in the negative.

Pp. 199-215. Arnold von Salis, Die Brautkrone. Von Salis maintains against Valentin Kurt Müller (Der Polos, Diss. Berlin, 1915, pp. 85-88) that some sort of crown or wreath worn by the bride was essential to the ritual of Greek marriage. The

fact that the young unmarried dead woman was considered the bride of Hades and therefore wore the wreath of a bride is indicated by several vase paintings.

Pp. 216-231. O. Hoffmann, Latina. 1. Latin *praedium* contains the preposition *prae*. It is derived, therefore, from *prae-dium*, in which the *-d-* represents the I. E. root *dhē-* 'setzen, legen.' Out of the abstract meaning the concrete has developed. Therefore, 'das Davor-Liegen' has become 'das davor-liegende Grundstück.' (Cf. Greek *προ-άστειον* and German Vor-werk.) 2. Das Imperfektum. The Latin infinitives *parā-re* and *legē-re* came from **parā-se* and **legē-se* (cf. *es-se*), and these apparently from **parā-s-i* and **legē-s-i*. If the view generally advocated is true, this infinitive was originally the locative of a verbal abstract in *-es*, and *legēr-e* (from **legēs-i*) exactly corresponds to a *scel-er-e* (from **scel-es-i*). There is no objection to assuming its original locative meaning for the combination of such an infinitive with the preterite **-fām* 'ich war.' Then **parāsi-fām* and **legēsi-fām* paraphrase the imperfect of the past exactly as do the German phrases 'ich war am Rüsten, beim Lesen.' In **parāsi-fām* and **legēsi-fām*, the voiceless spirant *-f-* between vowels, according to original Latin phonetic laws, changed by way of the voiced spirant (*b*), to the voiced explosive *-b-*: thus **parāsi-bam* and **legēsi-bam*. The unaccented vowel of the middle syllable had already disappeared to a great extent even in prehistoric times. Thus we have a further shortening from **parāsi-bam* and **legēsi-bam* to **parās-bam* and **legēs-bam*. And in this form the *-s-* must have disappeared before the voiced *-b-* with resulting lengthening of the preceding vowel; thus *parā-bam* and, with compensatory lengthening, *legē-bam*.

Pp. 232-239. L. Radermacher, Christus unter den Schriftgelehrten. Discussion of the story told by Luke of "Christ among the Doctors." Radermacher does not think there is any saga-motif to be discovered here (i. e. the motif of youthful precocity) or any connection with similar stories told of Augustus (Suet. Aug. 94, 6), Alexander (Plutarch, Alex. p. 666e), Buddha (Clemen Rel.-gesch. Erkl. 243 f.), and the Egyptian Si-Usire (Griffith, Stories of the High Priests of Memphis, Oxford 1900, I 11 ff.; II 27). Radermacher suspects the numbers three and twelve, which figure in the story of Luke, of being merely approximations. He cites many examples of their use in this sense.

Pp. 240-242. Kurt Witte, Das achte Gedicht der theokritischen Sammlung. The seventh tetrad (57-60) is genuine and belongs to the same speaker as does the sixth (53-56). According to tradition, the seventh belongs to Menalcas. That this was not the case originally is demonstrated by the epigram of Eratos-

thenes Scholasticus (Anth. Pal. VI 78). Its sources are the epigram of Theocritus (Anth. Pal. VI 177) and the tetrad VIII 57-60. We may assume that in the edition of Theocritus used by Eratosthenes the strophe 57-60 belonged to Daphnis, and that a tetrad has fallen out in our tradition. The missing tetrad stood after verse 52. In it Daphnis spoke of Naïs. It formed together with the extant one (49-52) the third double tetrad. The whole poem should consist of four double tetrads and two octads.

ROBERT PARVIN STRICKLER.

KINGWOOD, WEST VIRGINIA.

REVIEWS.

Collectanea Hispanica. Par CHARLES UPSON CLARK. (Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. XXIV. 1920.) Paris: Champion. 243 pp. 70 plates.

Any objections that a hostile critic might wish to apply to the present volume are answered by the title. The term *Collectanea Hispanica* makes no claim to a finished performance. One obvious imperfection immediately meets the eye in the diminutive and often scarcely decipherable plates. But these do not represent Professor CLARK's idea of what reproductions of manuscripts should be. In a rapid and extensive journey through Spain, undertaken in 1907 mainly in behalf of the late lamented Dr. Rudolf Beer of Vienna, he took with a small camera a large number of photographs of characteristic books, many of which had never been reproduced in any way. He had time for making only a few notes on the manuscripts that he photographed, but the collection served his purposes for his courses in palaeography, and seemed so valuable to Dr. Beer that the latter urged its publication. The work is written in French. It was ready in 1910, but various reasons, including the war, have delayed its appearance. The small photographs were somewhat enlarged and turned into admirable heliotypes by Champion. After all, even the most minute reproduction can be read easily with a glass,—and that is less expensive than taking a trip to Spain.

Such is the apology for the plates; the work as a whole needs no apology. Professor CLARK, after doing full justice to his predecessors in this subject, states precisely what he has accomplished (p. 22) :

Dans le présent ouvrage enfin, on trouvera des reproductions de mss. jusqu'ici très difficiles à étudier, comme le palimpseste de Léon, l'onciale de Barcelone, le Veronensis, le Cavensis, les Legionenses de la Bible, le fameux Alvarus (Smaragde) de Cordoue; le premier aperçu un peu détaillé des travaux antérieurs sur l'écriture wisigothique; la première description minutieuse des particularités de cette écriture; la liste de M. Lowe notamment complétée; des listes de mss. datés, de copistes, de provenances, etc., plus complètes, en ce qui concerne les mss. encore existants, que celles de Beer. Je ne prétends point avoir dit le dernier mot sur le sujet; j'espère pourtant que ce recueil contribuera à la solution des problèmes relatifs à l'histoire intellectuelle de l'Espagne pendant le Moyen-Age.

Perfectly conscious of what he has done and what he has not done, CLARK has added to his edition of Ammianus Marcellinus another noteworthy contribution to learning. In the development of writing in Spain, he has a great and fascinating theme. Though he does not pretend to have reached the goal, he has taken a long stride forward.

CLARK has sifted and sorted his complicated material with

skill. He gives us first, after a comprehensive bibliography, a list of all manuscripts, fragmentary or complete, that are known to him, assigning them Arabic numbers from 500 to 713. The total number, two hundred and fourteen, exceeds by one hundred the manuscripts discussed by E. A. Lowe in his valuable brochure, *Studia Palaeographica*, published in 1910.¹ Some of the additions,—a majority, I should judge—CLARK himself unearthed; for the rest he expresses indebtedness to Lowe, Lindsay, Dom Wilmart, and last but not least, Abbé Liebaert, whose death in 1915 cut short a career of fine achievement and most brilliant promise.

In the above list, which I will call No. I, the manuscripts are grouped according to the libraries in which they are found today. There follow No. II, a chronological list of extant dated manuscripts, and No. III, a list of scribes and illuminators. List IV contains the places in which manuscripts are surely known to have been written. No. V is a list of fac-similes, including the plates in Ewald-Loewe (IV-XXXVIII), those in the present work (1-70), and (71-161) those in various publications to which reference is made. Finally, No. VI, come the descriptions, with careful transliterations, of his own plates. By this arrangement, one finds at a glance all the material important for the study of various topics.

There is one inconvenience, easily avoidable, in the disposition of the material. In the account of the manuscripts shown in the plates, the information is divided between No. I and No. VI. Despite the use of cross-references,² it is something of a nuisance to keep an eye on two widely separated sections of the book, besides the plate itself, and especially to find—though this is a rare occurrence—that the information is not quite consistent in the two descriptions.³ This difficulty might have been obviated if the description in No. I had been reduced to lowest terms—designation of the manuscript, date, contents, and a reference to the number of the plate, where everything else would be found. In the case of manuscripts not illustrated in the plates, the complete account would of course appear, as now, in No. I.

Encouraged by this plentiful array of lists, I feel like demanding one more,—that of the authors contained in the different manuscripts, which would be chronologically arranged under each name. Such a list would be an index, however in-

¹ In the Munich *Sitzungsberichte*, No. 12.

² No. 589 lacks a reference to Pl. 37, and the description of Pl. 37 to No. 589. No. 628 should refer to Pl. 21.

³ The description of No. 524 is divided between p. 41 and p. 228 in a most inconvenient way. The dating of Lowe for No. 534 (s. Xⁱⁿ) is accepted on p. 34, but on p. 69 that of Ewald-Loewe, s. X/XI.

complete, of the literary interests of Spain, and would reveal the astounding paucity of the Classical authors accessible in Visigothic manuscripts. St. Isidore, St. Gregory and Beatus would loom large in the list, but the stray Terence of the eleventh century seems like an unwelcome guest. It is the only manuscript of a pagan Latin author in the Visigothic script. The manuscripts are not our only clue, but in themselves, we must note, they give little encouragement to those who would trace the pedigree of various Classical texts in the early Middle Ages from France back to Spain. There were doubtless lines of tradition running from Spain northward down to the times of St. Isidore and the learned bishops of Toledo, but the coming of the Moslems worked for Latin literature in Spain what the Middle Ages did for Greek literature all over Europe. We must make allowance for exaggeration, but, in general, the dismal picture of Spanish culture painted by Eulogius and Albarus⁴ is confirmed by the testimony of the Visigothic manuscripts described by Professor CLARK.

However, the Moslems had a culture of their own, and, as everybody knows, exerted a profound influence on later mediaeval thought, and in Spain, on mediaeval art. There is a highly important bit of testimony presented in these *Collectanea* of a much earlier interchange of views between Arabs and Christians than has been thus far noted. Historians who have touched on this movement begin their account with the career of the learned Gerbert († 1003), who in his youth had studied mathematics at Barcelona, and they tend to minimize the importance of Arab influence at that time. But Moslem culture had become well established at the end of the seventh century, and it flourished in the centuries following; Cordova became the Bagdad of the West. Spain was rife with theological controversy in the eighth century, owing to the heresy of Adoptianism, and one of CLARK's manuscripts shows that a Christian thinker had studied the Arabs as well as the Fathers of the Church. In one of the two Visigothic manuscripts at Monte Cassino, containing St. Ambrose's work against the Arians, some reader has added marginal notes in an interesting kind of cursive. Since he refers to the heretic Elipandus as a man of his own times, he must have lived either at the end of the eighth century or very early in the ninth. One of his notes is thus deciphered by CLARK:

Hinc destrues errorem Ibin hamd[on] qui alium esse ho[mi]num, alium domini nostri Ihu xpi asserit patrem.⁵

The last word is hard to make out. The form of the letter *p* is peculiar,⁶ and the theological conception, if *patrem* is what

⁴Manitius, *Gesch. der lat. Lit. des Mittelalt.*, 1911, p. 422.

⁵No. 640 (Pl. 12, p. 132), Casinensis 4.

⁶Apparently it has a loop on the left side, a form not mentioned by

the Arab wrote, is more than peculiar. Who Ibin Hamdon was I have not been able to find out.⁷ Whether or not he was a convert to Christianity, he took an interest in Christian theology and made a somewhat startling contribution to it. Now the manuscript also contains notes in Arabic; there is one, still undeciphered, on this page. Is the scribe a Moslem critic of St. Ambrose or a convert from Islamism? Did he perhaps write the Latin note as well? The author of this, at any rate, is either a native Christian who has studied the Arab writers or a converted Arab who naturally has not forgotten them. These are both tiny notes, but with others of the same nature,⁸ they bear witness to an important phase of society in Spain manifest as early as the eighth century,—an intellectual give and take between the conquerors and the conquered. Moeller, in his *History of the Christian Church*,⁹ noting the similarity of Adoptianism to Nestorianism, suggests that “the controversy was perhaps influenced by the old Antiochene tendency, through Oriental Christians who had come to Spain in the train of the Arabs.” Ibin Hamdon would seem to be of such a tribe.

CLARK's account of the characteristics of Visigothic writing is noteworthy for its caution. Despite his familiarity with a wide range of manuscripts, he is not inclined to theorize much as to the development of the script, believing that Merino, Muñoz and Lowe have gone too far in this direction. He quotes with a modified approval Lowe's description of the essential epochs in the history of Visigothic writing; he cannot subscribe to it fully. Lowe's four classes seem to the reviewer broadly enough stated to allow for exceptions; there is nothing that I have observed in CLARK's new material that tends to diminish their value. Lowe's memorable criterion for dating Visigothic manuscripts—the use of different forms of the ligature *ti* to express the assimilated and the unassimilated sound of these let-

H. B. Van Hoesen, *Roman Cursive Writing*, 1915, p. 237, though two of the sixth-century forms of the letter show a tendency in this direction; see Table 6, Nos. 16 and 19.

⁷ Could the name be Ibin Hamdin? An Ibin Hamdin was kadi of Cordova in the eleventh century. See Dozy, *Hist. des Musulmans d'Espagne*, iv, 251 ff. Clark's transliteration of the note agrees with that of the monks of Monte Cassino (*Bibl. Cas.* I p. 99). As they give another note (p. 100) containing the name Ibn Hamdon, the complete form may appear in that place. They describe the note to the eleventh or the twelfth century,—falsely if the script is the same as that of the present note.

⁸ There are evidently other bits of Arabic in the margins of the manuscript, as there are in Cas. 19 “saec. IX” (*Bibl. Cas.* p. 233). All of these should be examined by some Arabist. A Latin-Arabic glossary is extant, compiled at least as early as the tenth century. See Clark's No. 554.

⁹ Translated by Rutherford, Vol. II (1893), p. 132.

ters¹⁰—CLARK fully accepts and uses constantly and successfully. Lowe's rule has thus run the gauntlet of new and considerable testing and has come out unscathed. His other principle, the frequent use of *i longa* in Visigothic, has not fared so well. There are plenty of illustrations of it, and plenty of exceptions; it is not so valuable as the former rule in determining dates.

On the origin of Spanish minuscule, little if any light is shed by the new material gathered by CLARK. It issues, like the other national hands, from the Roman cursive. For Italian script there is such an abundance of cursive and half-minuscule texts that one can see the national hand growing as naturally as a plant from the old Roman cursive into the full flower of the Beneventan style.¹¹ In Spain there are so few traces of cursive, and these are so late, that the minuscule of the end of the eighth century appears as a sudden phenomenon without precursors. As CLARK believes that he has listed virtually all the Visigothic manuscripts in existence, this part of the subject can be cleared up only by some unexpected discovery. A study of the Visigothic charter-hand might yield some information; it is to be regretted that the *Collectanea* offer no specimens of this hand.

Whatever caution should be observed in details, we may safely enough select the creative period in the history of Visigothic script as the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century, a period roughly corresponding with the reign of Alphonso the Great (866-910). Lowe enumerates the essential characteristics of this script, which forms the second of his four classes.¹² In general, I think it may be said that this is the period in Spanish writing that most nearly suggests, not in its appearance, but in its observance of definite principles, the script of St. Martin's of Tours in the generation of Alcuin and that which succeeded him. It is during the reign of Alphonso that the *ti*-distinction, only loosely observed before, is adopted as a permanent trait of Visigothic. It is then also that the scribe begins to take such an interest in his product that he attaches his name to it.¹³

The first of the scribes in CLARK's list and the first, so far as he or Lowe has observed, to use the *ti*-distinction, is a certain Maius, who in 894 wrote at San Miguel—a monastery of uncertain locality—a wonderful illustrated manuscript of Beatus. This manuscript, then, ushers in the period. CLARK lists it (No. 570) under London, where it once belonged to Henry Yates

¹⁰ *Op. cit.* pp. 76 ff.

¹¹ Particularly as set forth in Lowe's *The Beneventan Script*, 1914.

¹² *Op. cit.* p. 80.

¹³ The list of scribes and illuminators of pp. 66 f. contains thirteen for the years 894-925, twenty-six for the rest of the tenth century, and twenty for the eleventh century.

Thompson. One American city will have to appear in a revision of this list, for the book is now among the treasures of the Pierpont Morgan Library of New York. It is gratifying that a work at once so intrinsically beautiful and of such historical importance should be accessible in our own country.

Another scribe whose work is adequately illustrated for the first time is Florentius, who wrote at Valeranica near Burgos in the middle of the tenth century. Plates 65-68 are devoted to one of his books (No. 512), a copy of Smaragdus, now at Cordova, which was the first Visigothic manuscript ever reproduced.¹⁴ On the strength of later reproductions, the manuscript has generally been assigned to the eleventh century. One gets the same impression of the slim and graceful letters of a highly ornamental script as we see it for the first time in an accurate reproduction. But with the help of external testimony furnished by Dom De Bruyne, CLARK fixes the date beyond question in the neighborhood of 960. There are three other manuscripts with the signature of Florentius, with dates running from the year 945 to 962. So round about the middle of the tenth century a new and delicate manner comes in, the essence of which is that assigned by Lowe to his third period. It is a fact like the overthrowing of previous judgments of this manuscript of Florentius that may well induce CLARK, after his survey of so large a field, to be slow in his ultimate conclusions.

As with the origins of the script, so with its disappearance before the all-conquering Caroline hand, a broad and unexplored field still lies before us. In the latter case, the investigator is not embarrassed, as in the former, with the lack of material. We also need a treatment of the relation of the French and Spanish systems during the time when the latter was in its prime. Spanish monks penetrated into the northern country at least as far as Lyons and Fleury and have left various mementoes of their presence. One of the most interesting is a manuscript of the Lex Romana Visigothorum (No. 650) at present in Paris. It is written in a Caroline hand from a Visigothic original; the scribe, unfamiliar with the abbreviations that he found, retains for *per* the form \wp which in his own script should stand for *pro*. In several places, he is evidently so puzzled at the text that he calls in a fellow-scribe, who inserts the passages—in Visigothic. A similar supplement in Visigothic appears in a manuscript of Lyons (No. 571). There are Visigothic marginalia in a famous book of Fleury.¹⁵ A study of all

¹⁴ In 1606, by Bernardo Aldrete.

¹⁵ No. 681, Vat. Reg. 267. CLARK's error in giving the contents of this book has already been corrected by Lowe (*Eng. Hist. Rev.* 1921, p. 465). It contains not the Sacramentarium Gelasianum but the works of Bishop Fulgentius. I can add that the Visigothic notes to which Liebaert called CLARK's attention are found on a score of pages and

the Carolingian books with Visigothic notes or supplements would be profitable. The period of interchange which they indicate would seem to be the latter half of the ninth century; but no positive statement can be made until the material is examined.

Despite his policy of caution, CLARK constantly gives his own opinion as to dates, to the great benefit of the discussion, and he not infrequently indicates the character of a script by comparing it with some other style. The cursive on Plate 12 reminds him of Bobbio, the minuscule of No. 534 s. X (Ewald and Loewe No. xxxvii) has "une ressemblance frappante avec celle du scriptorium de Saint-Gall en Suisse," while the latest style of Visigothic writing shows a "faible ressemblance" to the Insular hand (p. 242). The last resemblance is, at least to my eye, feeble indeed, and the others are hardly worth the noting. All early cursive is more or less the same, and a Visigothic hand of the early tenth century suggests only one period in the history of the script of St. Gall, that represented by Winithar in the eighth;¹⁶ by the beginning of the tenth century, the period with which comparison would be profitable, altogether different methods were in vogue at St. Gall. The superficial resemblance between the earlier style of St. Gall to that of Spain about a century later is due to the development of both hands from the same origin. The point to observe is not the resemblance at the start but the difference in the speed and character of the development.

The account of Visigothic abbreviations is the best that has appeared. It may seem strange that Lindsay's *Notae Latinae*, 1915, is nowhere mentioned, not even in the bibliography, but as is explained in the preface, the circumstances of printing account for this omission. CLARK published a review of Lindsay's work,¹⁷ with extensive additions of details drawn particularly from Spanish manuscripts.

There is a brief discussion of diacritical signs and of punctuation, a subject on which CLARK promises a comprehensive work. In general, the ancient system of employing a dot half way up the letter, or near its base, for a half-stop, and a dot near the top of the letter for a whole-stop, is observed by Spanish

run through the volume. The hand seems to be of the ninth century; in the one test case that I noticed, the *ti*-distinction is not observed. The MS itself, partly in uncial and partly in semi-uncial script, was doubtless written at Fleury not long after its founding in the seventh century. (See Chatelain, *Unc. Scrip.* Pl. xxx, lxxix.) Some Spaniard, who read it there about two hundred years later, added in the margin headings and comments such as (fol. 190): *non quantum quis uiator sed qualiter*, and (fol. 226v): *ausculta o peccator et gaude*. CLARK should have given a reference to Bannister, *Pal. Mus. Vat.* No. 122, with a reproduction, Pl. 15a. I have several photographs.

¹⁶ See Chroust *Mon. Pal.* I xiv, 1-5. ¹⁷ *Class. Weekly* 1917, p. 189.

scribes. The former is often accompanied by a superimposed stroke sloping to the right, like an acute accent; the latter often has a downward stroke, placed sometimes beneath the dot, sometimes at its side. The final pause may also be denoted by three dots. It would have been easy to represent in the transliterations the main varieties employed. The interrogation mark is reproduced, but by using merely a dot for all other punctuations, CLARK imparts to the sentences a jerky and inconsequential character that is not fair to the actual methods of the scribes. Periods, inverted periods, commas and single quotation-marks would have illustrated the punctuation with substantial accuracy; or at least commas might have been used for the minor pauses.

Signs are employed in the early Visigothic manuscripts not only for punctuation but for accentuation (p. 105) and likewise for marking prosody. In a manuscript of *Juvencus* and other Christian poets (No. 628, s. IX/X), the shorts and longs of two verses of *Fortunatus* are indicated as they would be to-day (Plate 21). It would seem also that the marking gives directions also as to the elision. Thus in the first line,

Aspérā cōndīciō ēt sōrs īnrēvōcābilis hōrē (*sic*)

the last two syllables of *condicio* are apparently treated to synizesis with shortening of the *o*. In the second line,

Quūm gēnēri hūmānō trīstīs ūrigō dēdīt

we are apparently enjoined not to clip the last syllable of *generi*, but to shorten the first two syllables of *humano*. The last bit of advice is unsound, but the gist of the matter, the sounding of *ri* and *hu* in conjunction, seems true to ancient practice. The caesura is marked by an upright stroke, and is apparently treated to an ictus, for the same sign is applied to the final syllable of the verse. These marks seem to be contemporary. If other cases of such a practice exist, they ought to be collected for their bearing on the vexed question of metrical ictus and elision.

Aware that a great work of this kind cannot be spotless on its first appearance, CLARK invites corrections and additions. There are doubtless few Visigothic books that are not registered here, but there is still some confusion as to the particular manuscripts to which various scholars have referred. The transliterations, which I have tested in many places, are done with scrupulous care. I discovered only a few trivial errors and misprints.

CLARK hopes that his material will be of service to the future historian of the development of writing in Spain. No palaeographer would fail to applaud if CLARK undertakes that task himself. A useful preliminary would be a study, with really

suitable fac-similes, of all the dated manuscripts. Nor would co-operation be out of place in so extensive an enterprise. As CLARK finds Lowe too audacious and Lowe thinks CLARK a bit hesitant, the proper combination of safety and speed would indubitably appear in a history of Visigothic script by CLARK and Lowe.

E. K. RAND.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

The Atharvavedīyā Pañcapaṭalikā throwing light on the Arrangement, division and text of the Atharva Veda Saṁhitā with a translation and an index of the pratikas. Edited by Bhagwaddatta B. A., Professor of Vedic Theology and Sanskrit and Superintendent of the research department, D. A.-V. College Lahore, 1920, 8° pp. 14 + 39.

Under the leadership of Bhagwaddatta the research department of Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College is showing noteworthy activity. Those interested in the Atharva Veda will be glad to see that it is directed largely to the task of rendering accessible the still unpublished ancillary literature of that Veda. In particular the class of works termed laksanagrantha or 'works devoted to the accurate description' of the saṁhitā seems to be the main objective. Of these the Caranavyūha (AV. Par. xl ix. 4. 8) lists five—not four as has generally been understood: (1) caturādhyāyikā (2) ṛātiçākhyam (3) pañcapaṭalikā (4) dantyoṣṭhavidhir (5, ṣr̥hatsarvānukramanī). Editions of the first four have been completed by these scholars, or are now nearing completion. The most interesting fact with regard to them is that the mss. collated for the caturādhyāyikā are said to contain considerable material not included in Whitney's edition. Interesting also is the fact that the ṛātiçākhya is (as noticed already by Bühler; cf. Bloomfield, *The Atharvaveda*, p. 20) a distinct work. The Pañcapaṭalikā is then the third in the list just quoted; and this harmonizes with the subtitle given by the editor—apparently on the basis of some tradition—tr̥tiya lakṣaṇa grantha.

In the occident the knowledge of this text has been a gradual acquisition. Whitney first noted certain short remarks in the colophons of his manuscripts of the Atharva and saw that they must be fragments of an "Old Anukramanī." Then Shankar Pandit gave more extensive quotations in his commentary; next these materials were worked up (cf. p. lxxi *et passim*) in the Whitney-Lanman translation. Now we are at last presented with the text in full. The edition seems—I must speak with reserve for I can use neither the introduction nor the translation

—to be based on three mss. and the Whitney-Lanman quotations. It may be presumed that these are the three mss. mentioned in Whitney-Lanman p. lxxii and that they are all the material available. The book went thru the press during a printers' strike, and has consequently a number of misprints which it is hoped to correct shortly in a second edition. Apart from these the editor has solved the problem of the *recensio* in good, workmanlike fashion which makes me all the more regret my inability to profit by his exegesis.

The broadest interest of this text is that it adds one more witness to a well-known fact—the painstaking philologic industry with which the Vedic theologians strove for the accurate perpetuation of their sacred texts. Beyond this, however, it throws light on certain details of the external form of the *Samhitā* which may be noted in connection with a short description of its contents.

The little treatise is divided into five chapters and twenty sections; but thru a mistaken repetition of 9 the number of the sections in this edition is reduced to nineteen. Chapter I, sections 1-4, treats in verse of the manner in which repeated portions of the text should be presented. In I. 4. 2 *tisrñām atrivat smṛtam* the word *atrvat* should have been printed as a *pratīka*; the meaning being that v. 23. 10-12 (= ii 32. 3-5) is an example of a passage where the abbreviation *iti tisrah* is to be employed. The reading of the Berlin edition and of most of Whitney's mss. for AV xviii 4. 26, and 43 is confirmed against 'Sāyana' and Shankar Pandit by the citation of the latter verse as one to be abbreviated by the *iti pūrvā* formula. This is a typical example of the position taken by this text when these other authorities differ.

Chapter ii, 5-10 in prose mentions a classification of the hymns into ṛkya, paryāyika and yajus and then proceeds to give book by book the usual number of hymns in an *anuvāka* together with the number of *anuvākas* that are exceptional. The text, in spite of its jejuneness, clears up several points in the interpretation of AV xix 23 about which the Whitney-Lanman translation was entirely at sea. In the first place *mahatkānda* is shown to mean, as Weber finally saw, the fifth book. For the item beginning *mahatsu* is placed between statements relating to Books i-iv and Book vi; it is said that with a single exception (later defined correctly as beginning with v 16. 1 and containing 6 hymns) its *anuvākas* consist of 5 hymns; and finally it is stated a few lines later that among the *mahānti* sc. *sūktāni* hymns are found consisting of all numbers of verses from 8 to 18 except 16. It follows, therefore, that AV xix. 23. 18 must mean: "To the book of the great hymns *svāhā!*" and that there can be no question of referring it to a "grand

division," or of transposing it to another place. AV xix 23. 1-17 must then refer to Books i-iv. If so, the additions " (in genuine Hindu fashion) merely for schematic completeness" are even more widespread than Lanman assumed; for in those books there are no hymns of 14, 15, 17 or 18 verses. I find no difficulty in believing that, and may point to the same force manifesting itself again at a later time when Sāyana's text inserts between 19 and 20 dvīycebhyaḥ svāhā. The item about Book vii in our text rkasūktā ekarceṣu seems corrupt. I may suggest¹ anekasūktā, "the anuvākas comprise various numbers of hymns." Some such meaning is guaranteed by the later enumeration of the number of hymns in every anuvāka, showing that no norm had been mentioned. Then follows: dvisūktāḥ kṣudreṣu clearly meaning Books viii-xi,² (cf. Lanman's citation from the Major Anukr. p. clviii) a meaning that is obviously acceptable also for AV xix 23. 21. Later we shall see that the Pañcapaṭalikā handles Books viii-xi as a single book—with the hymns numbered consecutively. The meaning of ekānṛcāni for AV xix 23. 22 is then pinned down to Book xii, since the following verse is rohitēbhyaḥ svāhā — Book xiii. The same meaning is possible for our text which reads anuvākasūktā ekānṛceṣu; but as the same is true of Books xiii-xiv, xviii as well, the meaning may have been extended to include them, or a sentence rohitāsūrya-yameṣu ca may have been lost. The problem is complicated by the mysterious term ekānṛcāni. To hazard a guess, these should be "hymns that comprise (an anṛcasūktam) a hymn that contains no verse from the Rig Veda." Now xii. i is such an anṛca, but there is nothing of the sort in xiii, xiv, or xviii; for xiii 4 as a paryāya-hymn is barred from the comparison. The matter is further obscured by the summary fashion in which the topic is closed: kāṇḍasūktāḥ ḡeṣe paryāyika-varjam. This should probably be amended to °sūktāḥ—but the division intended for Book xviii is uncertain, for there is a variety of opinion about xvii or xvii-xviii; vrātyaprājapati(ya)yor eva pṛthag vibhāṣitam uttaram yat. Then follow a couple of obscure sentences—seeming to say that the normal length of a hymn varies according to the book, and that exceptions occur only in excess of the norm, and then the passage relating to Book v already cited.

The following section (6) gives the number of hymns in the anuvākas that are exceptions to the above rules. In Book vii

¹ The correction to rk-sūktā translated, Whitney-Lanman, p. cxlix, "among the one-versed hymns (the anuvākas consist) of hymns made of one verse" is nonsense in this context.

² They are called kṣudrāṇi "minute," I presume, because they are so long—oxymoron.

every anuvāka receives treatment, and after that book there are no exceptions. The arrangement follows the order of the saṁhitā, except that all anuvākas with the same number of hymns are listed together under the first occurrence of an anuvāka with that number. The divisions accord exactly with the Berlin edition.

Sections 7 to 10 give the number of verses for those hymns in Books i-vii which have a number of verses that does not conform to that given by the title (caturçāni etc.) of the book. The arrangement is the same as for the anuvākas, except that in Book vii the various items are arranged according to the number of verses (2-verse hymns, 3-verse hymns etc.) not according to the position of the first hymn in each item. The shift is probably due to the fact that the two systems happen to coincide for Book vi. For Book v the title (mahānti) suggests no number; accordingly no number is treated as a "norm" but the number of verses in each hymn is listed. Among these are two (v. 9, 10) with eight verses, the mention of which would be a departure from the system without parallel in this text, had 8 been regarded as a "norm" for this book.³ In the seventh book hymns 74 and 76 were postponed for separate treatment; otherwise the statements and implications about the hymn division are in exact agreement with the Berlin edition.⁴ The statements of the Major Anukramanī accepted by Lanman, p. cxlix n. are explicitly or implicitly contradicted: 68 and 72 are listed as 3-verse hymns, 6 as a 4-verse hymn, while 55 as being a 1-verse hymn is not mentioned. Twenty-six (not 30) hymns are listed as two-verse hymns and they are those of the Berlin edition. At the close stands the following: apacitām iti tadarthaśūktāni catvāri|apacidbhēṣajam|iṛṣyāpanayanam|vratopāyanam|goṣṭhavratiyām ca to indicate a division: 74. 1-2 a cure for apacits; 74. 3 to exorcise jealousy; 74. 4 at the entrance upon a vow; 75. 1-2 for the goṣṭhavrata. The last hymn has been recorded as dvyr̥ca in its proper place, and its inclusion here serves merely to give the student his bearings. The division is obviously sensible. A similar treatment of hymn 76 should follow or the hymn should have been listed among the caturçāni where there is, however, no temptation to haplography, which might render its omission there plausible. I assume, therefore, a lacuna at this point.

³ According to Whitney-Lanman, p. cxlviii, n. 2, the Major Anukramanī has such a deviation in specifying that i. 1 is a caturrea. The Pañcapatalikā is consistent in making no mention of this fact, nor does it share the other two errors mentioned in this note.

⁴ When vii. 80 is cited as a caturream there is a parenthetical remark that it includes an ekarcam to Prajāpati—clearly the third verse is meant.

Chapter iii, sections 11-14, contains prose lists⁵ of the verses with one, three, four or five punctuation marks, implying that the others have two.

As the Berlin edition has generally followed closely the mss., its punctuation is usually that of the Pañcapaṭalikā. The latter differs, however, in classing as: 1-avasāna verses i 26. 2, 4, xii 2. 44; 3-avasāna iv 38. 7, viii 5. 22, xvii 1. 6-8, 10-13, 16, 18-19, 24, xviii 4. 88; 5-avasāna ix 5. 33. I have made no attempt to check the dvyavasāna, but have noted incidentally that xvii 1. 17 and xviii 4. 86-87 are printed otherwise in the Berlin edition. In the last passage Whitney-Lanman incline to bringing the text into harmony with the Pañcapaṭalikā by inserting an avasāna mark. The whole difficulty is apparently due to the failure (p. 869) to interpret correctly "the strange ityātas" of the itiprabṛti . . . ityātas formula. In the "Old Anukramaṇī" ityātas occurs not only here, but in several other passages and always means "up to but not including . . ." The statement is consequently that verses 71-85 (not 71-86) are 1-avasāna: thus leaving verses 86 and 87 to be punctuated alike with two marks. It would seem that ityātas might then be interpreted ity ā atas. Returning to the above list, a comparison of the Whitney-Lanman translation will show that in all these instances the Berlin edition has departed from the manuscripts.

The fourth chapter, sections 15-18, deals with the number of verses in each anuvāka, or rather that is the subject up to the end of the seventh book. From the eighth to the eleventh book (incl.) the counting is, as we are explicitly told, by hymns. After that the count is by anuvākas which consist, however, always of one hymn except in the paryāya books. The chapter is metrical and the numbers called "norms" in the Whitney-Lanman translation are chosen merely to get the statements into a convenient metrical form. This is clear; but, if proof is desired, reference may be made to the treatment of Book vii to which two verses are given. The first says of the first five anuvākas that they contain so many verses above twenty; the second describes the last anuvākas without reference to any "norm," giving simply the numbers twice twenty-one, thirty, twenty-four, twenty-one, thirty-two. Book xiii is handled in the latter fashion simply because the numbers to be mentioned (60, 46, 26 *rcas* 6 paryāyas) are widely scattered. It offers no foundation for the theories of Whitney-Lanman, p. 708, cxl. The subject matter for Books i-vii occasions no comment. One verse (4. 15. 3) is assembled in Whitney-Lanman p. cxl, the others are given piecemeal at the ends of the anuvākas. I may

⁵In the tryavasāna list the items for Books xvii and xviii have been transposed.

note that the obscure ekatriṣaṭis tryaçitih (p. 258) now turns out very simply ekavrṣas tryaçitih; and the answer to the puzzle on p. 295 is: dvyadhikāv apacid-dvitīyāu.

Books viii-xi (the kṣudrāni cf. above) are next treated in seven verses. That the author regards these four books as a unit is manifested in many ways: (1) His system of presentation is to group all hymns with the same number of verses together, picking his examples from any book, for instance: prāṇāya (xi. 4) brahmācāri (xi. 5) ca

yāu te (viii. 6) indrasya prathamah (x. 4) kutah (viii. 9)
ye bāhavas (xi. 9) trtiyam (viii. 3) tu
sapta ṣadviṇçakāni tu

(2) All the paryāya-hymns are similarly grouped in one verse.⁶

(3) The author numbers across the division between Books viii and ix, calling ix 8 the eighteenth, ix 9, the nineteenth, ix 10 the twentieth hymn. That he does not cite from Books x-xi in the same fashion is due simply to metrical convenience, for he does cite xi 10 as the 'last' (antya) hymn.

(4) The next to the last verse, which clearly must be transposed⁷ to the end, lumps the rest of the hymns:

dve tisro viṇçatih pañca caturdaça caturdaça
casraḥ saptānupūrvena ḡeṣāḥ syus triṇcateḥ parāḥ

The remainder of the chapter occasions no comment beyond noting that Book xvii follows Book xviii through some accident.

The fifth chapter, sections 19-20, treats in verse of the subdivisions of the paryāyas. Its statements agree with the divisions of the Berlin edition except for the fourth and fifth paryāyas of ix 6 which are here made to contain ten avasānarcas apiece. The mss. are said to be divided.

Two points stand out:

1. There are in general two lines of tradition: (a) Pañcapaṭalikā—the majority of the mss.—the Berlin edition; (b) the Major Anukramanī—Sāyāna—the minority of the mss.—Shankar Pandit—and to some extent Whitney-Lanman. As a matter of *recensio* the first of these lines is entitled to the preference.

2. The Whitney-Lanman arrangement of the Saṁhitā into

⁶ But one pāda reached the Whitney-Lanman translation. So it seems worth while to quote the verse, which at least goes far towards settling the question raised by Lanman, p. 611 by confirming the division of the Berlin edition.

virād vā tu ṣaṭ paryāyū yo vidyād iti ṣaṭ smṛtāḥ
prajāpatis tathāikah syāt trayas tasyāudano bhavet

⁷ At least two other passages are similarly misplaced, and there are besides probably the lacunas already mentioned. This points to a single archetype derived probably from a damaged (worm-eaten) manuscript.

three grand divisions i-vii, viii-xii, xiii-xviii is deprived of the support from the Pañcapaṭalikā claimed (cxxxix f.) by Lanman. It is not necessary to argue the matter in detail (the source of the error is largely the belief in "norms" for the anuvākas) for the one clearly marked grouping in the Pañcapaṭalikā is viii-xi which is confirmed by the Saṁhitā itself and is fatal to the scheme of the grand divisions. Whatever the merits of this arrangement may be, they are the results of nineteenth century logical analysis and destitute of historical significance. If the external peculiarities of the Saṁhitā can give any clue to the process of its compilation, they tend to point rather in this direction: Books i-vii are a section formed by the combination of two collections, both arranged according to the number of verses in the hymns, but one in an ascending, the other in a descending scale. A second edition is the kṣudrāni,—recognized as a unit in AV xix 23. 21,—four books viii-xi with the external peculiarity of having two hymns to an anuvāka. A third section is composed also of four books xii-xiv, xviii containing anuvāka-sūktas, and grouped according to subject matter in contrasting pairs bhāuma-sāurya, wedding-funeral.* Within this section Books xv, xvi, xvii have been afterwards interpolated.

One may congratulate Dayanand College and Mr. Bhagwad-datta upon the publication of this text and look forward with interest to the appearance of its successors.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

Anaximander's Book, The Earliest Known Geographical Treatise. By WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL. Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Vol. 56, No. 7. Pp. 237-288. April, 1921. Library of The American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 28 Newbury Street, Boston, Mass. \$1.00.

Professor HEIDEL has omitted, as being foreign to his purpose, a discussion of the philosophic theory of Anaximander, which forms the subject of a previous study by him in *Classical Philology* VII 212-234. He has likewise refrained from taking up anew the discussion of the word *φύσις*, which he has so exhaustively treated in "A Study of the Conception of Nature among the Pre-Socratics," Proceedings of the American Acad-

*If my interpretation of ekānrcāni is correct, its use for Book xii can best be understood as originating in this group.

emy of Arts and Sciences XLV 79-133. He has, however, subjected to the closest scrutiny and weighed with the utmost care all the available evidence with reference to the literary and scientific activity of Anaximander. The conclusion reached by him is that Anaximander wrote a single work—a geographical treatise—and that the various titles current at one time or another in antiquity represent but so many different names either of the work as a whole or of its constituent parts. The character of the book is described by the author on pp. 237 sq. as follows:

"In compass it cannot have been large, if the statement of Diogenes Laertius, which in this particular is probably drawn from either Apollodorus or Posidonius, is true; for he reports that Anaximander gave 'a summary exposition of his opinions.' In spirit and intention it was historical, purporting to sketch the life-history of the cosmos from the moment of its emergence from infinitude to the author's own time, and looking forward to the death and dissolution not only of the earth and its inhabitants but also of this and all particular worlds. This being so the exposition naturally followed the order of chronological sequence, recounting first the origin of the world and of the earth, proceeding with the origin of life and the evolution of species capable of living on land as the once all-engulfing sea gradually allowed dry land to appear, the origin of human life, probably in Egypt, and the spread of the race and its civilization. Heroic genealogies bridged the interval between the beginnings and the disposition of the peoples and their habitats in Anaximander's time, which were, however briefly, sketched in his book as well as figured on his chart. In this portion of his treatise, presumably, occurred some at least of the explanations which he gave of certain outstanding natural phenomena, such as earthquakes, and such strictly historical data as the old Milesian saw fit to give. They would most naturally concern the royal houses, not improbably linked up with Heracles, of the great powers of Asia, the Lydians and the Medes."

Limitations of space preclude the possibility of giving even a brief account of the course of the argument. Suffice it to say that Professor HEIDEL appears to have made out his case. It is to be hoped that the essay will be widely read. The young scholar will find it a source of inspiration and a mine of information; and the veteran will be sure to read it with pleasure and profit.

C. W. E. MILLER.

BRIEF MENTION.

INDEX SCOLIODROMICUS.

(Grammaticos) intra muros peccatur et extra.

The story of the section of the American Journal of Philology known as Brief Mention has been told over and over again in Brief Mention itself, and need not be repeated here. A list of the syntactical observations contained therein is comprised in the Indiculus Syntacticus published in 1916 (A. J. P. XXXVI 481 ff.) for the possible use of those who might be interested in that line of study. Now at the instance of one near to me who was led to believe that a similar list of my extra-syntactical notes would be welcome to declared friends of Brief Mention, a register of those divagations has been prepared, and it appears in this number of the Journal, under the old familiar heading, with the kind permission of the present editor.

The title "Index Scoliodromicus" was suggested by an article on Brief Mention in the New York *Independent*. The index itself has been compiled under my direction by Dr. Lawrence H. Baker, of the Johns Hopkins University, who has not only satisfied the exacting conditions of the task, but has cheered the way by hearty goodwill and ready sympathy.

B. L. G.

Abbé Espagnolle, Etymological Dictionary, XVIII 123
Accents as indicators of pitch, XL 221
Accent, nature of, XXXIV, 114
Achalme, Indictment of German nation, XXXVIII 223
Aischylos, Septem 83, note on, I 515; interpretation of his death, XXXVI 358
Agathias' ἐπιτύμβια, XXXIX 220
Allusive style, XXXII 113, 483; dangers of, XLI 92
Allusions, ancient and modern, XXVII 111
American and European universities after the war, XXXIX 427
American humor, XLI 93
American independence and scholarship, XXXVII 113
American irony, perils of, XXXII 118
American work in archaeology, XXIV 108
Animals in antiquity, monographs on, XV 256
Apple as emblem of love, XXII 470
Apollonius, figures in XXXV 227; literature on, XXXIV 370
Archaism, a study of in Euripides, XXXVIII 339
Archaeologists' Greek, XXXV 361
Archaeologists' tales, XXII 228
Aristophanes' Acharnians, comments on, XV 257; Clouds 870, XII 123; Pax 241, XXXII 119
Aristophanes and Rostand, XXXIII 227; and Athenian politics, XXVII 354
Aristophanic metres, XXXIV 104
Aristotle, Politics, VII 125
Aristoxenus' theory of musical rhythm, XXXIII 232

Arnold, Matthew, on Empedocles, XXX 475
 Art and artifice in Greek poetry, XXXVI 366
 Aspects of Modern Greece, XXXIII 365
 Ass in Greek Art, XXXIV 238
'Αθηναῖον πολιτεῖα, XIV 125
 Autoschediastic repriminations, XXVI 113
 Bauer, Adolph, Thucydides and H. Müller-Strübing, VIII 117
 Bayfield, Leaf and Bayfield, Homer, XVI 397
 Bibliographies, XXXIV 369
 Birds of antiquity, XVI 527
 Blunders, typographical and typical, I 514; XXIII 234; XXIX 246;
 XXX 230; XXXI 113, 367, 492; XXXII 486; XXXIII 113, 115;
 XXXIV 116, 242, 371; XXXV 117, 235; XXXVI 360; XXXVII 380;
 XXXVIII 112, 113, 226; XXXIX 103, 104, 220; XL 107
 Boeckh, irreverence toward, XXXVII 242; tribute to, XXVIII 232
 Bréal, Essai de Sémantique, XXI 476
 Bréal, Homer, XXIV 353
 Brief Mention, history of, XXV 351; XXX 105; XXXIII 105
 Brief Mention, suppressed and unsuppressed, XXXVIII 454
 Browning, and Aristophanes, XXXI 487; and cheap learning, XXXII
 485; improprieties in, XXXI 488, XXXII 241, XXXVI 236; classi-
 cal and scriptural allusions in, XXXII 483.
 Bruns on Dionysius, XXV 356
 Bury, Plato's Symposium, XXXII 233
 Byzantine culture as field of study, XXXII 118
 Carlyle, definition of genius, XXXVII 379
 Ciaceri, edition of Lycophron, XXII 344
 Cicero's jests, XII 519
 Classical Review, first number of, VIII 119
 Classic metres in English verse, XXX 554
 Cohan and traditions of the stage, XXXIII 108
 Comedy, origin of, XXXVII 109
 Concrete style, XLI 403
 Conjectural emendations, I 242; XXIII 347; XXIV 107; XXVI 113,
 114; XXVIII 487; XXXVI 362; XXXVIII 114.
 Crambe repetita, XXX 227
 Cretic and the dying fall, XXXVII 121
 Culture, a youthful lecture on Greek culture, XXVIII 107
 Demetrius Phalereus and the study of rhetoric, XL 337
 Demosthenes, characteristics of, XXVII 232; XXXIV 234; notes on De
 Corona, XXXIV 367
 Dictionaries, English and Greek, XII 385
 Doctoral dissertation, the, XXIX 113
 Doctus poeta, XXXVII 379
 Drerup, on Goodwin's De Corona, XXIII 109
 Drumann, notes on Cicero, XX 351
 Editorial methods, XXI 112
 Eidographic methods, XXXIII 105, 108, 487
 Ellis, Havelock, "Affirmations," XXXVII 116
 Ellis, Robinson, Fables of Phaedrus, XV 520; Latin as a medium,
 XXXVI 231
 Endor, the witch of, XXXIV 364
 English language and German scholars, XIX 464
 English iambic dipody, vindication of, XXX 356
 English and German scholarship, XXXVI 359; XXXVII 494, 495,
 498; XXXVIII 225
 Epidaurus, account of, XXI 107
 Epigram and sonnet, analogy of, XXXIII 111; XL 223
 Epigrammatic speech and the Classics, XXXV 492

Eryximachus, XXXII 114
Essays and Studies, foreign opinions of, XXV 354
Etymologies, false, I 515
Euripides, notes on, XXXII 360; XXXVII 372ff; XXXVIII 339, 341
European and American universities after the war, XXXIX 427
Exaltation of Presocratic Philosophy, XXXI 109
Exegesis as a personal and national index, XXX 225
Expurgation and expurgators, XXI 229
Fennell's style and character, XXXVII 241
Figurative language in Demetrius, XXIV 104
Flaws in classical research, XXXI 241
Force of periphrasis, XXI 473
Freeman, preface, XXXIV 369
Freud as syntactician, XXXV 108
Frischlin's comedies, XXXIII 231
Fronto, characteristics, XXV 357; XXXII 362
Ganymede misunderstood, XXXV 241
Gender in language, XXVII 360
German methods, lack of artistic impulse XXXVII 503; value of, XXXVII 500; treatment of American scholars, XXIII 109
Germany before the War of 1870 and after, XXXVI 240; and the Classics XXXV 109
Goethe's Lebensregeln, XXXVI 241
Goethe's love affairs, XXIII 110
Gladstone on Homer, XL 107, 333
Goldsmith's epitaph, XXXVIII 460
Grammar, and its detractors, XXV 354; Osler on, XXX 108; examples, XX 459
Grammatical references, unnecessary multiplication of, XXXI 115
Grammatical theories, practical tests of, XXVII 108
Graux, Charles, XII 517
Great War, philology and, XXXVI 241
Greek Battlefields, XXIV 359
Greek diet and Brief Mention, XXX 105
Greek notes revised, XVII 390
Greek Renaissance, authors of, XIX 115; XXXIV 365
Greek studies in Germany after the war, XXXVIII 455
Grotius, Mare Liberum, ch. 13, XXXVIII 255; reference to Sophocles, XXXVIII 225
Hawthorne, Wonder Book, XXXIV 241
Heffelbower, rendering of Croiset, XXVI 115
Hegelian Triad, XXXIII 106, 487
Heliolater, solar myth, XXIX 117
Hellenistic Greek, XXX 229
Hellenistic Studies, Society for Promotion of, XXXVI 113
Herakleitean obscurity, XXIII 345
Herakleitos, poetry of, XXIII 347
Herakleitos and Herakleides confounded, XXXIII 114
Hermann, Gottfried, Opuscula, XXV 225; prefaces, XXXIV 369
Herondas, Mimes, XIV 125
Hesiod, Eduard Meyer on, XXXII 365
Heyse, Paul, poem by, XXII 230
Hipponax, description, XXVI 115
Historical parallel bars, XXIV 480; XXXI 111; XXXIV 240; XXXV 369; XXXVII 118, 503; XXXVIII 334, 338; XXXIX 427; XL 102; XLI 202
Hoeufft Prize Composition, XXII 111
Homer, Iliad X, XXXII, 236
Homeric scholia, study of, XXXIV 362

Horace, characteristics of, XXXI 485; sweethearts of, XXXI 485
 Hübner, on Cicero, XX 230
 Impression and analysis, XXI 352
 Impressionistic syntax, XXXIII 240
 Inadvertencies, so-called, XXX 112
 Incongruities and oddities, XXVIII 351
 Indices and index makers, XXVI 237
 Indiculus Syntacticus, XXXVI 481
 Influences of linguistic studies on interpretation of literature, XXV 232
 Internal evidence, XXX 110
 Isocratean syntax as gnomon of style, XXXIII 235
 Isocrates, characteristics of, XXVI 237
 Isocrates and modern times, XXVIII 112; *Panegyricus*, XXXVIII 459
 Italian scholarship, XXIV 108
 Jebb, Growth and Influence of Classical Poetry, XV 118; Posthumous Essays, XXVIII 479
 Julius Redivivus, XXXIII 231
 Knapp, Interpretation of Sophocles' *Antigone*, XXXVIII 337
 Körte, Expurgations in Aristophanes, XXXVI 236
 Lamb, on Cornford's *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, XXXVII 117
 Landor, Pericles and Aspasia, XXXIV 238
 Language as a gnomon of culture, XXXIX 452
 Language, its pudencies and reserves, XXXVI 117
 Lanier, Sidney, Shakespearean lectures, XXX 111
 Latin as a medium, XXX 360; XXXVI 231
 Latin pronunciation, XXVII 107
 Leaf and Bayfield, Homer, XVI 397
 Legrand, Theocritus, XXI 350 ff.
 Lesbos, Symonds' description of, XXXV 106
 Life of a man of letters, XXV 357
 Lykophron, notes on, XXII 344
 Mackail on Parmenio, XL 222
 Marx on classical metres, XXIX 368, 502
 Meisterhans, Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften, XXI 473
 Menander, the New, XXXII 362ff.
 Mercantile element in editors' choice, XXX 226
 Metres, absence of treatment in Merry's "Peace," XXI 232
 Metrical systems and artistic fitness, XXXVI 361
 Metrical theories, oscillations and nutations, XXXIV 104
 Milton and the Classics, XXI 234
 Modern discoveries and ancient rhetoric, XXXVII 380
 Modern Greek, I 241, XXVII 235
 Morley and Goethe's *Lebensregeln*, XXXVI 241
 Müller, Iwan, Hdb. der Klass. Altertumswissenschaft, VI 398
 Müller, Lucian, *De Re Metrica*, XVI 393; XXXIII 112
 Müller, Max, What to do with our Old People, XX 460
 Musicians, age of, XXXIII 240
 Necessity of the Classics, quotations from, XXXVII 496
 Necrology:
 Bréal, Michel, XXXVIII 111
 Butcher, S. H., XXXII 122
 Earle, M. L., XXXIV 115
 Ellis, Robinson, XXXIV 494
 Goodwin, W. W., XXXIII 367
 Jebb, R. C., XXVII 479
 Kontos, Konstantinos, XXX 480
 Monro, D. B., XXVIII 478
 Morgan, M. H., XXXI 243
 Moulton, R. G., XLI 95

Seymour, T. D., XXIX 124
 Smith, K. F., XL 110
 Usener, H., XXVII 102
 Weil, Henri, XXXI 117
 Whitney, W. D., XV 258
 Wilson, H. L., XXXIV 116
 Wölfflin, E. von, XXIX 498
 Wright, J. H., XXIX 498
 Nestle, Wilhelm, Euripides der Dichter der griechischen Aufklärung,
 XXIII 111
 Nestor and the Iliad, XXXV 113
 Nietzsche and Greek genius, XXXVII 116
 Nomenclature of rhetoric, XXXI 237
 Oddities and incongruities, XXVIII 351
 Odysseus a sun myth, XXVIII 234
 Osler on influence of Hellenism, XXXII 112
 Papyrus Th. Reinach, XXVII 107
 Parenthesis as gnomon of style, XXXIV 111
 Passow, notice of new edition, XXXIV 239
 Paucity of production, XXXVII 501
 Paulus Silentarius, XXXVIII 111, 227
 Pausanias, notes on, XVIII 119; as a prototype, XXXV 106
 Pearson, Fregg. of Sophocles, XXXIX 103
 Pecz, Wilhelm, Tropes in Greek writers, XXXV 227
 Persius, notes on XXXVIII 111; topographic illustrations of,
 XXXIII 236
 Philostratus, style of, XXXIV 365
 Piron, epitaph on Olivet, XXV 355
 Pindar,
 and Aegina, XXIV 122
 Aeacus myth in, XL 104
 attitude in Persian Wars, XXVII 485
 and Browning's Ring and the Book, XXXII 482
 Bury, Isthmian Odes, XIII 385; Nemean Odes, XI 528
 Cerrato, Olympian Odes, XXXVII 242; on Olympia VIII, XL 106
 Cézard, on Pindar's metres, XXXIII 234
 Christ, Pindari Carmina, XVII 517
 chronology, XXI 470ff.
 death of, XL 449
 dissidences among interpreters, XXIX 122
 dramatic element in, XXXIII 491
 English editions of, XXXVII 378
 estimates of, XXVI 360; XXVII 483; XXVIII 479; XXXIX 430;
 XLI 200
 and the eternal feminine, XVIII 124
 Euripides and, XXXVII 370
 Fr. 169, XL 220
 Gaspar, Camille, Essai de chronologie pindarique, XXI 470
 Herakleitos and, XXXIII 346
 '*Ιστρέφανοι Αθάνατοι*, XXXII 366
 Isthmia II, 8, XXXVIII 110
 metres of, XXXIII 234
 Nemea I, 29 ff., XXX 233; Nemea VI, 57, XXXIX 104
 Νόμος in, XL 218
 Olympians, Cerrato, edition of, XXXVII 242
 Olympia II, 77, XXXI 238; Olympia IV, XXIX 502; XXXIII
 105; XXXVII 370; Olympia VIII, XL 102; 103; 106
 order, chronological, of odes, XXI 471
 Oxyrhynchus Papyri, XXIX 118

political attitude of, XXXIV 109
Pythia II, 82; XXVIII 109; XXXVIII 110; Pythia IV, XXXV 368;
Pythia VIII, XXXI 489; Pythia IX, XXXVIII 334; Pythia
X, XXI 471
pannus purpureus, XXIX 123
quotableness of, XXXII 480
repetitions in, XXIX 120
Seymour, Select Odes, XXIX 119
Schroeder, edition of, XXX 112
structure of, XXVI 359
sonnet and Pindar, XLI 199
Tennyson on, XXVI 360; XXXIX 430
Theognis and, XXXIII 106
translators of, XXXVII 232 ff.
Pegasus, perversions of, XXVI 360
Plato,
Bell, A. G., How to Improve the Race, XXXV 107
eugenics in, XXXV 107
Eryximachos in, XXX 109
Gomperz, Plato's Laws, XXIII 471; notes on Plato's style,
XXIII 472
hiatus in, XXII 349
Homeric citation in, XXIII 233
humor of, XXXVI 475
order of dialogues, XXII 348
physician's social position in antiquity, XXX 109
playfulness of, XXVI 361
puns in, XXXV 364
quotations from poetry, XXIII 233
Symposium, XXX 109
Theaetetus 149B, XXXVI 475
Warren, Republic of Plato I to V, XI 125
Polarization, XXIV 361
Polybius, personality of, XXIII 350; literary limitations of, XXIII 349
Poetical topography, XXXV 105
Poros, reminiscences of, XXXIII 364
Progress of doctrine, XXXI 114
Pronunciation of Latin, XXIII 470
Prose rhythm in Greek and English, XXXVII 119
Quintilian as a stylist, XXXI 234
Rabelais, XL 107, 221
Reading en suite, XXV 225
Recurrent words, XXXVIII 337
Rees, The so-called rule of three actors, XXX 111
Reminiscences of
Bekker, XXVIII 113
Bréal, XXXVIII 111
Bywater, XXXVI 476
Ellis, R., XXXVI 476
Harrison, Frederic, Autobiographical Memoirs, XXXIV 366
Lysianic reminiscences, XXXVIII 457
Mahaffy, XL 446
Mommsen, XXV 113
Ritschl, XXIV 484
Sylvester, XLI 401
Welcker, XXXIV 232
Renan, on style, XXVI 361

Reviews:

Abbott, Dr. E., Easy Greek Lessons, VII 545
 Adams, Henry, The Education of, XL 335
 Allen, Remnants of Early Latinity, I 244
 Bardt, C., Die Sermonen des Quintus Horatius Flaccus, XXXV 368
 Bauer, Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte, XX 225
 Bayfield, Leaf and, School Edition of *Iliad*, XIX 346
 Bell, A. G., How to Improve the Race, XXXV 107
 Bellermann, Ludwig, Trans. of Sophocles' *Ajax*, XXXIII 228
 Bérard, Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée, XXVII 359
 Biese, Alfred, Griechische Lieder in Auswahl, XII 518
 Bitell, The Minnesingers, XXX 357
 Blass, Bacchylides, XIX 346; Hermeneutik und Kritik, VII 274,
 XVI 127; Über die Aussprache des Griechischen, IX 378
 Bodrero, Eraclito, XXXI 108
 Bréal, Interpretation of Song of Arval Brethren, I 244; Essai de
 Sémantique, XVIII 368
 Brenous, Études sur les hellénismes dans la syntaxe latine, XVII
 519
 Brugmann, Law of Dissimilation of *ē* in Ionico-Attic, XIX 115
 Bruns, Attische Liebtheorien, XXX 110
 Burn, Robert, Roman Literature in Relation to Roman Art, IX 255
 Büdinger, Max, Poesie und Urkunde bei Thukydides, XII 518
 Bury, J. B., Nemean Odes of Pindar, XI 528; Isthmian Odes, XIII
 385; Plato's Symposium, XXXI 366
 Bussell, the School of Plato, XVIII, 494
 Butcher, Some Aspects of the Greek Genius, XII 521; Greece and
 Israel, XXV 483; Harvard Lectures on Greek Subjects,
 XXV 482
 Bywater, On Aristotle's Poetics, XIX 233
 Carpenter, Rhys, Ethics of Euripides, XXXVIII 340
 Cauer, P., Kunst des Übersetzens, XXXV 368
 Cerrato, Luigi, Edition of Pindar's Olympians, XXXVII 242
 Cézard, Métrique sacrée des Grecs et des Romains, XXXIII 233
 Christ, Pindari Carmina, XVII 517; Geschichte der griechischen
 Litteratur, XIX 345
 Ciaceri, Edition of Lycophron, XXII 345
 Clark, Fontes Numerosae, XXXI 114
 Conybeare, Philo on the Contemplative Life, XVI 260
 Conybeare and Stork, Selections from the Septuagint, XXVII 104
 Cooper, Lane, Methods and Aims in the Study of Literature,
 XXXVII 379
 Croiset, Aristophane et les partis à Athènes, XXVII 354; XXVIII
 238
 Crusius, Commentationes Ribbeckianae, X 382
 Cucuel, Éléments de paléographie grecque, XII 517
 D'Alton, Horace and his Age, XXXIX 430
 Darkow, A. C., Spurious Speeches of the Lysianic Corpus, XXXVIII
 455
 Dalmeyda, Bacchae of Euripides, XXX 226
 Deecke, Auswahl aus den Iliasscholien, XXXIV 362
 Demoulin, Epiménide de Crète, XXII 346
 Diels and Schubart, Didymos *περὶ Δημοσθένους*, XXV 478
 Diels, Herakleitos von Ephesos, XXXI 108
 Dragoumis, Mrs., Tales of a Greek Island, XXXIII 363; A Man of
 Athens, XXXVIII 333
 Drerup, Edition of Isocrates, XXVIII 112
 Drysen, Paul, Greek Anthology, I 243
 Earle, Oedipus Tyrannus, XXII 227; Medea, XXVI 111
 Elliott, Acharnians of Aristophanes, XXXVI 113

Ehrlich, Untersuchungen über die griechische Betonung, XXXIV 114
 Ellis, Havelock, The World of Dreams, XXXII 478
 Freeman, History of Sicily, XII 520
 Forman, Aristophanes' Clouds, XXXVII 114
 Forster, Isocrates' Cyprian Orations, XXXIII 235
 Gardthausen, Catalogus Codicum Graecorum Sinaiticorum, VII 272
 Gayley, Classic Myths in English Literature & Art, XXXII 240
 Girard, Aristophanes and Nature, XXXII 366
 Gomperz, Platonische Aufsätze, IX 378; Die Apologie der Heilkunst, XI 529
 Goodhart, Thucydides VIII, XV 115
 Goodwin, Midiana of Demosthenes, XXVII 232
 Gow, James, Companion to School Classics, IX 256
 Grasserie, De la Catégorie du genre, XXVII 360; Particularités linguistiques, XXVIII 235
 Grundy, Thucydides and the History of his Age, XXXIII 237
 Grünewald, Die Satzparenthese bei den zehn Attischen Rednern, XXXIV 111
 Gudeman, Latin Literature of the Empire, XIX 462; Grundriss zur Geschichte der klassischen Philologie, XXXI 113; Imagines Philologorum, XXXII 240
 Guglielmino, Arte e artifizio nel dramma greco, XXXVI 366
 Haigh, The Attic Theatre, XIX 463
 Hale, Studies in Nomenclature, XXXI 112
 Harder, Schulwörterbuch zu Homers Ilias und Odyssee, XXIII 112
 Harris, J. Rendel, Teaching of the Apostles and the Sibylline Books, VI 401; Scene of the Ninth Similitude of Hermas, VIII 389; Origin of the Cult of Apollo, XXXVII 107; Origin of the Cult of Aphrodite, XXXVII 504
 Hayley, Alcestis, XIX 344
 Headlam, Election by lot at Athens, XII 522; posthumous Agamemnon, XXXI 493
 Heffelbower, Translation of Croiset, XXVI 115
 Heiler, De Tatiani Apologetae dicendi genere, XXXI 240
 Helbig, W., 'Ιππεῖς Athéniens, XXIV 483
 Hermann, Lateinische Litteraturdenkmäler, XXXIII 230
 Hill, Sources of Greek History, XVIII 494
 Holden, Plutarch's Gracchi, VI 264; Xenophon's Cyropaedeia, VIII, 387, 512; XII 387
 Holbrooke, Aryan Wordbuilding, XXXII 114
 Horton-Smith, Conditional Sentences, XVI 122
 Hübner, Exempla scripturæ epigraphicae, VI 262; Monumenta linguae Ibericae, XV 119
 Humphreys, Demosthenes' De Corona, XXXIV 234
 Hutton, Thucydides and History, XXXVIII 338
 Hyslop, Euripides' Andromache, XXI 232
 Jackson, Jerusalem the Golden, XXXI 239; Aristophanes' Apology, XXXI 487
 Jahn, Platonic Anthology, XI 126
 Jäger, Homer und Horaz im Gymnasialunterricht, XXIX 118
 Jebb, Theophrastus, XXX 228; Ajax, XVII 390; Selections from the Attic Orators, X 123
 Jowett, Trans. of Aristotle's Politics, VII 125; of Plato, third edition, XIII 259
 Jurenka, Pindar, XV 398
 Kaibel, Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta, XX 108
 Kaiser, Quaestiones de elocutione Demosthenica, XVI 395
 Kenyon, Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens, XII 259; Bacchylides, XVIII 442; Palaeography of Greek Papyri, XX 229
 Klostermann, Origenes, XXXIV 364

Kromayer, Antike Schlachtfelder in Griechenland, XXIV 359
 Krumbacher, Legend of St. George, XXXIII 112
 Kulik, De M. T. Ciceronis poetarum Latinorum studiis, VIII 116
 Kultur der Gegenwart, XXVII 109
 Kunst, De Theocriti versu heroico, VIII 116
 Lamb, Clio Enthroned, XXXVI 108; XXXVII 116
 Lawton, Successors of Homer, XIX 348
 Leaf, Walter, Homer's Iliad I to XII, VII 271
 Leaf and Bayfield, School Edition of the Iliad, XIX 346
 Legrand, Études sur Théocrite, XXI 350; Daos, XXXII 362
 Leo, Originality of Roman Literature, XXV 479
 Lias, First Epistle to the Corinthians, VII 543
 Lietzmann, Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen, XXXIV 362
 Livingstone, Greek Genius and its Meaning, XXXIV 486
 Ludwig, Homerischer Hymnenbau, XXX 234
 Macan, Herodotus, XVII 126
 Macé, Alcide, Latin Pronunciation, XXVII 107
 Mackail, Select Epigrams, XXXIII 227
 Mackie, E. C., Lucian's Menippus and Timon, XIII 384
 Mahaffy, Greek Life and Thought, IX 255; Flinders Petrie Papyri, XIII 383
 Manatt, Aegean Days, XXXV 105
 Manning, A Study of Archaism in Euripides, XXXVIII 339
 Marchant, E. C., Thucydides II, XIII 257; Thucydides II, III, VII, XVIII 244
 Marshall, Xenophon's Anabasis, VII 544
 Mayer, Hermann, Prodikos von Keos, XXXV 112
 Mayor, J. E. B., Latin Heptateuch, X 383
 Menander, works on, XXXII 363
 Merriam, Herodotus, VI 262
 Merrill, W. A., Latin Hymns, XXV 484
 Merry, Aristophanes, XXI 229; XXXIV 108
 Meyer, Five Ages of Hesiod, XXXII 365
 Miles, E. H., Comparative Syntax of Greek and Latin, XXXII 115
 Monro, D. B., Iliad, V 402; Odyssey, XXIII 233
 Mooney, Apollonius of Rhodes, XXXIV 370, XXXV 227
 Morgan, Eight Orations of Lysias, XVI 396
 Moulton, R. G., Ancient Classical Drama, XXX 111
 Murray, Rise of the Greek Epic, XXIX 117; Translation of Iphigenia, XXXI 359; Euripides and his Age, XXXVI 230
 Nairn, Herodas, XXV 227
 Nauck, Schneidewin-Nauck, Sophocles, XX 227
 Navarre, O., Essai sur la rhétorique grecque, XXI 472
 Nestle, Wilhelm, Euripides der Dichter der griechischen Aufklärung, XXIII 111; Thukydides und die Sophistik, XXXVI 103
 Newcomer, De Cyclope Homeric et Euripideo, XX 461
 Osgood, Classical Mythology of Milton's Poems, XXI 234
 Otte, Interpretation of Katharsis in Aristotle, XXXIII 229
 Ouvré, Les formes littéraires de la pensée grecque, XXV 233
 Page, Palmer, Wilkins, Edition of Horace, XVIII 121
 Palmer, Arthur, Heroines of Ovid, XIX 461
 Pascal, On Aristophanes, XXXII 237
 Pearson, Phoenissae, XXXII 360; Juvenal, VIII 253
 Peetz, Wilhelm, Tropes in Greek Writers, XXXV 227
 Perrot, Tribute to Weil, XXXII 118
 Pezzi, Lingua greca antica, IX 256
 Phoutrides, The Chorus of Euripides, XXXVIII 341

Pöhlmann, Griechische Geschichte, XXXI 111
 Postgate, Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society, V 542; Flaws in Classical Research, XXXI 241
 Ramorino, Edition of Persius, XXVII 103
 Ramsay, Selections from Tibullus and Propertius, VIII 254
 Radermacher, Demetrius *περὶ ἐρμηνείας*, XXIV 105
 Reiter, De Syllabarum Usu Aeschyleo et Sophocleo, VIII 116; Iphigenie auf Tauris, XXI 112
 Richards, Notes on Xenophon and Others, XXVIII 485; Aristophanes and Others, XXXI 115
 Ridgeway, Essays and Studies in Honor of, XXXV 361; Theory of Origin of Comedy, XXXVII 109
 Robert, Studien zur Ilias, XXII 467
 Roberts, Rhys, Edition of Longinus, XX 228; Demetrius, XXIV 103; Literary letters of Dionysius, XXIV 101; Dionysius on Literary Composition, XXXI 234; Patriotic Poetry in Greek and English, XXXVIII 223
 Robertson, Gorgianic Figures in Early Greek Prose, XXI 473
 Robin, Théorie platonicienne de l'Amour, XXX 110
 Robinson, D. M., Review of Mooney's Apollonius, XXXV 227
 Rutherford, Scholia Aristophanica, XVIII 244; XIX 347
 Rzach, Hesiod, VI 121; Iliad, VII 126
 Sampson, The Deer's Bill of Fare, XXVIII 238
 Sandys, Demosthenic Orations, XXI 110; History of Classical Scholarship, XXVIII 239
 Schmid, Wilhelm, Atticismus, XVII 518
 Schmidt, C. E., Parallel-Homer, VI 399
 Schmidt, J. H. H., Synonymik der griechischen Sprache, VII 406
 Schmidt, M. C. P., Curtius' Alexander the Great, VII 275
 Schneidewin, Die antike Humanität, XVIII 242
 Schneidewin-Nauk, Sophocles, XX 227
 Schöne, Hug's Plato's Symposium, XXXII 230
 Schroeder, L. von, Griechische Götter und Heroen, VIII 511
 Schroeder, Otto, on *νόμος*, XL 218; Pindar, XXX 112
 Schubart, Diels and, *Διδύμος περὶ Δημοσθέους*, XXV 478
 Schwartz, E., Charakterköpfe aus der antiken Literatur, XXVII 483
 Seymour, Select Odes of Pindar, XXIX 119
 Scott, E. J. L., Verse Translation of Vergil's Eclogues, V 544
 Sharpley, Aristophanes' Peace, XXVII 228
 Shewan, The Lay of Dolon, XXXII 236
 Shorey, Horace's Odes and Epodes, XIX 344; XXXI 485
 Sidgwick, Aeschylus' Choephoroi, V 544
 Smith, B. W., Der vorchristliche Jesus, XXIX 240
 Skene, A. P., Ante Agamemnona, XIV 258
 Stawell, Miss, Review of Heracliti Quaestiones Homericae, XXXIII 114
 Starkie, Wasps of Aristophanes, XIX 113
 Sterrett, Homer, XXIX 116
 Steup, J., Classen's Thucydides, XVIII 122
 Strachan, Herodotus, XII 388
 Strong and Pearson, Juvenal, VIII 253
 Stryker, Letters of James the Just, XVI 526
 Swete, Septuagint, IX 126
 Symonds, Studies of the Greek Poets, XIV 261
 Taccone, Pindar's Fourth Pythian, XXXV 368
 Thompson, E. S., Meno, XXXII 109
 Thomson, Studies in the Odyssey, XXXVIII 222; Greek Tradition, XXXVIII 222
 Tozer, Selections from Strabo, XV 522
 Tucker, Thucydides, XIV 396

Usener, Altgriechischer Versbau, VIII 510; Göttliche Synonyme, XIX 343

Vahlen, Ennius, XXIV 483

Van Leeuwen, Wasps of Aristophanes, XXXI 364; Prolegomena ad Aristophanem, XXXI 490

Van Wageningen, Persius, XXXIII 236

Verrall, Studies in Greek and Latin Scholarship, XXXV 491; Literary Essays Classical and Modern, XXXV 491

Von Arnim, Dio von Prusa mit einer Einleitung, XIV 521; XIX 232; Supplementum Euripideum, XXXIV 363

Von Essen, Index Thucydideus, IX 255

Von Scala, Staatsverträge des Altertums, XX 352

Von Dobschütz, Christusbilder, XX 350

Von Gebhardt, Gospel of Peter and Revelation of Peter, XIV 396

Wagner, Richard, Articular Infinitive in the Attic Orators, IX 254

Warren, Plato's Republic, XI 125

Was, Symposium, VIII 389

Wecklein, Aischylos, V 543

Weil, Aischylos, V 543; Études sur le Drame antique, XVIII 243; Medea, and Iphigenia in Aulis, XX 353; Études sur l'Antiquité grecque XXI 235

Wilamowitz, Perser des Timotheos, XXIV 110, 222; Reden und Vorträge, XXII 231, Griechische Literatur, XXVII 357; Mimnermos und Properz, XXXIII 361; Sappho und Simonides, XXXIV 232; Aischylos, XXXVI 358

Wilkins, Horace's Epistles, VI 264

Williams, C. F. A., The Aristoxenian Theory of Musical Rhythm, XXXIII 232

White, J. W., The Verse of Greek Comedy, XXXIV 104

Wolff, S. L., Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction, XXXIII 358

Wright, Studies in Menander, XXXII 363

Wunderer, Similes and Metaphors in Polybios, XXXI 366

Zacher, Aristophanes' Peace, XXXII 119

Zander, Eurhythmia, XXXII 115

Zarncke, Die Entstehung der griechischen Literatursprachen, XI 125

Zielinski, Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte, XVIII 242

Rhetoric, the study of, XXXI 234; XXXVIII 380; XL 337

Roberts' Dionysius of Halicarnassus, XXXI 234

Remus, Uncle, note on author of, XL 337

Rhopography, ancient and modern, XXX 477

Robert, Homogeneity of Culture in Iliad and Odyssey, XXII 468; Urilias, XXII 469

Rosenberg, Revision of Westermann's De Corona, XXV 226

Rostand and Aristophanes, XXXIII 227

Rhythrical reading of Greek lyric poetry, XXXIII 233

Rhythrical study, importance and limits of, XXXII 115

Rhythm of prose, XXXII 115

Rostand, Cyrano de Bergerac, XXXIV 488

Sandys, History of Classical Scholarship, addenda, XXIX 499

Schmid, Atticismus, volume on Aelian, XIV 520

Scholastic view-points, shifts in, XXXVIII 339

School-editions and their characteristics, XXV 352

Septuagint Greek, XXVII 105

Sexual theory of the cases, XXXVII 107

Shakespeare and Greek, XXIII 467, the untranslatable, XXXVII 371

Shuckburgh, Sidney's Apologie for Poetrie, XII 122

Sidney, Greek scholarship of, XII 385

Sonnet and epigram, analogy of, XXXIII 111; XL 223
Style of Thucydides, XXXVI 108
Sophocles' sententiousness, XXXIX 99
St. Augustine, *Retractationes*, XXXVIII 222
Stanwell, notes on Persius, IX 126
Statistics, difficulties of in poetry, XXXV 227; legitimate use of, XIII 123
Summer vacations of scholars, XXVI 358
Synonyms in Greek, XXXV 112
Syntactical index, XXXVI 481
Syrian writers of Greek, XXX 240
Tebtunis Papyri, XXIV 109
Timotheos, Battle of Salamis, XXIV 226; Text, XXIV 231
Thesaurus, Greek Thesaurus projected, XXX 112
Thompson, D'Arcy W., father and son, XVI 527
Three, the number three, XXX 234
Thucydides, XXXIII 237, XXXVI 104, 105, 107, 108; XXXVII 117, 119
Towle's *Protagoras*, X 502
Translations and translators,
 Allen, Catullus' Attis, XIII 518; XIV 259
 &*v* and *kev*, XXXVII 368
 atmosphere of translation, XXXIX 105
 Bellermann, Sophocles' Ajax, XXXIII 228
 Bevan, Elizabethan English and Greek translation, XXIII 467;
 cf. XXXII 116
 Cauer, Die Kunst des Übersetzens, XXII 105, XXXV 368
 contrast between German and English as mediums, XXII 105
 criticism of translations, XXIII 468
 Cudworth, Odes of Horace, XL 107
 dangers of translation, XXIII 468
 &*e*, translation of, XXXVII 367
 Diels, Herakleitos von Ephesos, XXIII 345
 "double entente," XL 334
 Elizabethan English and Greek, XXIII 467; XXXII 116
 English metres analogous to Greek, XXXVI 235; XXXVII 236
 euphemism in translation, XL 334
 galliambic, English equivalents of, XIV 259
 Greek, and Elizabethan English, XXIII 467, XXXII 116
 haunts of the particles, XXXVII 369
 Heffelbower's Croiset, XXVI 116
 Hemphill, Persius, XL 335
 Historical novels, XXXII 358
 Horace, translations from, XXI 108
 Kallimachos' Herakleitos, XXXIII 112, 485
 Leonard, Empedocles, XXX 474
 Mackail, Select Epigrams, XXXIII 227
 Morgan, Xenophon on Horsemanship, XV 256
 Murray, Gilbert, XXX 353; XXXI 359; XXXIII 485
 naturalization of Greek metres, XXXVI 235; XXXVII 236
 Pallis, Iliad, XXI 233
 particles in translation, XXXVII 238
 Paton, Greek Anthology, XXXVIII 110
 Paulus Silentarius, XL 448
 Phillimore, Philostratus, XXXIV 364
 Pindar and his translators, XXXVII 233 ff.
 Ramsay, Persius, XL 332
 Reinach, Sophocles' *Ixneval*, XXXIII 485
 Reproductions of stylistic effect, XXII 107

Rhyme in translation of the classics, XXXI 358, XXXVI 234;
 XL 107

Roberts, De Compositione, XXXI 236

Scott, E. J. L., Calpurnius, XII 122

Starkie, Greek, and Elizabethan English, XXXII 116; cf. XXIII 467

Tolman, The Art of Translation, XXII 105

translation of Greek particles, XXXVII 367

Tyrrell, Metre of Allen's translation of Catullus' Attis, XIV 259;
 cf. XIII 518

Wilamowitz, XIII 517; XX 110; XXXIII 361

Triennium philologicum, XXXVII 500

Vahlen, Johannes, XXII 229; XXVIII 232; XXIX 500

Vance, Byzantinische Culturgeschichte, XXXII 118

Van Leeuwen, Enchiridion, XXXIX 428

Verrall, Euripides the Rationalist, XVI 261; Introduction to the
 Choephoroi, XIV 398; Fortitude of, XXXV 492

Von Leutsch, XXXIII 233

Wilamowitz, his range, XXXVII 500; discarding of Greek accents,
 XL 221; on the Agamemnon, XL 223

West, Value of the Classics, XXXIX 105

Wolf, Pretensions of, XXXIX 429

Words and their ways,

- abstract noun, XX 111
- αἴγλωψ*, XVI 261; XXV 352
- ἄν* and *κεν*, XXXVII 368
- ἀρετή*, XXXV 367
- ἀρεταλογία*, XXVIII 238; XXXV 367
- "between," trans. of, XII 385
- compounds in Antiphon and Isoocrates, XXVI 238
- διαπλέκει*, XXX 358; XXVIII 109
- Δίσκος*, a pun, XXII 345
- ἐνιαυτός* and *ἴτης*, XXI 353
- ἐστρίς*, XXXI 238
- ἴππος*, XXXI 498
- κεν* and *ἄν*, XXXVII 368
- Lais, etymology of, XXXIX 220
- monosyllables in English, XXXIV 116
- neck and crop, XXII 232; XXVIII 115; XXXIV 239
- νόμος*, XL 218 ff.
- ποικιλά*, XXXIX 102
- personality, XXXIV 233
- σοφιστής*, XXXIX 102
- steed*, XXXI 361; XXXIV 238
- strange obsolescence, XXXV 235
- τὸ θεῖον* vs. *φύσις ἀναγκαῖα*, XXXVI 105
- synonyms in Plato, XXXV 234
- τε*, XXXI 361
- φιλολογικαὶ ὑποτυπώσεις*, VI 399
- ψυχρὸν παραγκάλισμα*, XXXV 492
- ψυχρότης*, XXX 231, 359

Xenophon, quotations from the *Anabasis*, XXXV 363

Zimmern, The Greek Commonwealth, XXXIII 365

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Ameringer (Thomas E.) *The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Panegyrical Sermons of St. John Chrysostom. A Study in Greek Rhetoric.* Catholic University of America Diss. Washington, D. C., *Catholic University of America*, 1921. 8°, 103 pp.

Bender (Harold H.) *A Lithuanian Etymological Index.* Princeton, *Princeton University Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press*, 1921. 8°, 307 pp. \$5.

Anaximander's Book, *The Earliest Known Geographical Treatise.* By William Arthur Heidel. *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.* Vol. 56, No. 7. Pp. 237-288. April, 1921. Library of The American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 28 Newbury Street, Boston, Mass. \$1.00.

Asterie. *Carmen in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano aureo praemio ornatum, accedunt quinque carmina laudata.* Amstelodami, *Ed. Academia Regia Disciplinarum Nederlandica*, 1921. 8°.

Bureau of American Ethnology, *Thirty-fifth Annual Report to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1913-1914.* Part I. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1921. Accompanying Paper: *Ethnology of the Kwakiutl.* By Franz Boas. Pp. 43-794 + Index.

Cauer (Paul). *Grundfragen der Homerkritik.* 3. umgearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage (1. Hälfte). Leipzig, *S. Hirzel*, 1921. 8°, 406 pp. 66 M.

Gagnér (Anders). *De Hercle Mehercle ceterisque id genus particulis priscae poesis Latinae scaenicae.* Gryphiswaldae, *Iulus Abel*, 1920. 8°, 221 pp.

Grierson (Sir G. A.) *Linguistic Survey of India.* Vol. IX. Indo-Aryan Family, Central Group. Part IV. Specimens of the Pahārī Languages and Gujuri. Calcutta, *Superintendent Government Printing*, India, 1916. Fol. 981 pp.

— — — Vol. X. *Specimens of Languages of the Eranian Family.* Calcutta, 1921. Fol. 549 pp.

Gudeman (A.) *Scholien. Kritikos. Kritische Zeichen.* (Sonder-Abdruck aus Pauly-Wissowas Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Bd. XI der I. Reihe und IIA der II. Reihe.) 48 pp.

Hammarström (M.) *Beiträge zur Geschichte des etruskischen, lateinischen und griechischen Alphabets.* Helsingfors, *Druckerei der finnischen Literaturgesellschaft*, 1920. (Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fenniae, Tom. XLIX, No. 2.) 4°, 58 pp.

Inter-América. *Español:* Volumen V, Núm. 3. Septiembre de 1921. New York, *Doubleday, Page & Co.*

Kirk (W. H.) *Uti legassit.* (Reprinted from *Classical Philology*, Vol. XVI, No. 3. July 1921.) Pp. 246-250.

Maccas (Léon). *La Question Gréco-Albanaise.* Nancy, Paris, Strasbourg, *Berger-Levrault*, 1921. 8°, 242 pp.

Manning (Clarence A.) The Problem of Unreality in Russian Literature. (Reprinted from the July number of *The Sewanee Review*, 1921.) 11 pp.

McKenzie (Kenneth) and Oldfather (William A.) Ysopet-Avionnet: The Latin and French Texts. Urbana, *The University of Illinois*. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. V, No. 4. November, 1919.) 8°, 286 pp. \$1.50.

Personalist (The). Vol. II, No. 4. October 1921. Los Angeles, *University of Southern California*.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Vol. XXXI, Núms. 1 y 2. Enero-Junio 1921. Habana, *Imprenta "El Siglo XX."*

Scott (John A.) The Unity of Homer. (Sather Classical Lectures, Volume I.) Berkeley, California, *The University of California Press*, 1921. 8°, 275 pp.

Taylor (John Wilson). Georgius Gemistus Pletho's Criticism of Plato and Aristotle. University of Chicago diss. Menasha, Wis., *George Banta Publishing Company*, 1921. 8°, 100 pp.

Van Buren (E. Douglas). Figurative Terracotta Revetments in Etruria and Latium in the VI. and V. Centuries B. C. London, *John Murray*, 1921. 8°, 74 pp. + 32 plates. 16 sh.

INDEX TO VOLUME XLII.

Abraham's Bosom,	162-167	Brief Mention,	370
ADAMS, LOUISE E. W. Rev. of Weege's <i>Etruskische Malerei</i> ,	283-284	<i>Index Scoliodromicus</i> ,	370-382
Anaximander's Book , Heidel's (rev.),	368-369	BROWN, W. N. <i>Vyāghramāri, or the Lady Tiger-Killer: A Study of the Motif of Bluff in Hindu Fiction</i> ,	122-151
And and Or ,	1-11	Brown's Stonyhurst Pageants (rev.),	280-283
Aristophanes , Comic Termina- tions in,	152-161	Butler's The Sixth Book of the Aeneid (rev.),	186
Aron's Matriarchy (rev.),	286-287	Caesura in heroic hexameter ,	289-308
Association Guillaume Budé's Publications ,	94	Carmen Saeculare of Horace ,	324-329
Atharvavediyā Pañcapatalikā, Bhagwaddatta's (rev.),	362-368	Chansons de Geste and the Homeric Problem ,	193-233
BAKER, LAWRENCE H. Index <i>Scoliodromicus</i>	370-382	Cicero, Biography of ,	285-286
Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve , To, v		Cicero's Ideal Constitution, Original Elements in ,	309-323
BAXTER, J. H. Contributions to Late Latin Lexico- graphy,	340-343	CLARK, CHARLES UPSON. Rev. of Schiaparelli's <i>La Scrit- tura Latina nell' Eta Ro- mana</i> ,	285
BENDER, HAROLD H. Fluctua- tion between <i>o</i> - and <i>ə</i> - Stems in Lithuanian,	330-334	Clark's Collectanea Hispanica (rev.),	354-362
Rev. of Aron's Traces of Matriarchy in Germanic Hero-Lore,	286-287	Clitarchus ,	40-57
Bhagwaddatta's Atharvavediyā Pañcapatalikā (rev.),	362-368	Coffey's Accidence of Hebrew Grammar (rev.),	88-90
BLAKE (FRANK R.) and EM- BER (AARON). Rev. of Coffey's Accidence of He- brew Grammar,	88-90	Collection des Universités de France ,	93, 94
Bluff in Hindu Fiction ,	122-151	Comic Terminations in Ari- stophanes , Part V,	152-161
Boethius , I. T.—Translator of,	266	Contributions to Late Latin Lexicography ,	340-343
BOLLING, GEORGE MELVILLE. Vulgate Homeric Papyri,	253-259	CRAIG, HARDIN. Rev. of Brown's Stonyhurst Pageants,	280-283
Reviews:		Crump's The Growth of the Aeneid (rev.),	185-186
Bhagwaddatta's Atharva- vediyā Pañcapatalikā,	362-368	CURTIS, C. DENSMORE. Rev. of Pais' <i>Fasti Triumphales Populi Romani</i> ,	92-93
Fischl's Ergebnisse und Aussichten der Homer- analyse,	85-87	Desultory Remarks on Latin Pronunciation ,	335-339
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's Die Ilias und Homer,	274-280	Die Endung des Partizipium präteriti der germanischen starken Verben ,	12-24
Books Received ,	95-96, 190-	DOLSON, G. BAYLEY. I. T.— Translator of Boethius,	266
	192, 288, 383-384		

Dramatic Compositions Copyrighted in the United States, 1870 to 1916 (rev.), 91-92

Dravidian Notes, 265

EBELING, HERMAN LOUIS. Report of Hermes, 344-348

EDGERTON, FRANKLIN. Report of Glotta, 80-83

EMBER (AARON), (BLAKE and). Rev. of Coffey's Accidence of Hebrew Grammar, 88-90

Endung des Partizipium präteriti der germanischen starken Verben, 12-24

Ernout's Lucrèce, De la Nature (rev.), 93-94

Etruskische Malerei (rev.), 284

First Ode of Horace, 73-76

Fischl's Ergebnisse und Aussichten der Homeranalyse (rev.), 85-87

Fluctuation between *o*- and *a*-Stems in Lithuanian, 330-334

FOSTER, B. O. Livy VII. xiv. 6-10, 174-175

Fowler's Aeneas at the Site of Rome (rev.), 186-187

FRANK, TENNEY. Horace, Carm. III, 4: Descende Caelo, 170-173

The Carmen Saeculare of Horace, 324-329

Reviews:

- Butler's The Sixth Book of the Aeneid, 186
- Crump's The Growth of the Aeneid, 185-186
- Petersson's Cicero: A Biography, 285-286

Fronto, Haines's (rev.), 188

GILDERSLEEVE, B. L. Brief Mention, 370

Index Scoliodromicus, 370-382

Gildersleeve, Basil Lanneau, To, v

Glotta, Report of, 80-83

GOODELL, T. D. Plato's Hedoniam, 25-39

Greek Pronunciation, 183-185

Haines's Fronto, Vol. II (rev.), 188

HARRER, G. A. Rev. of Hasebroek's Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Septimius Severus, 284

HARRY, J. E. Sophocles Philoctetes 1360-61, 77-79

Hasebroek's Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Septimius Severus (rev.), 284

HAUPT, PAUL. Abraham's Bosom, 162-167

Hebrews, Epistle to the, Compared with Paul's Epistles, 58-72

Hedonism, Plato's, 25-39

Heidel's Anaximander's Book, etc. (rev.), 368-369

Hermes, Report of, 344-348

Hexameter, Word-Ends and Pauses in, 289-308

Hindu Fiction, Study of the Motif of Bluff in, 122-151

Hispanica, Collectanea, 354-362

Homer, Die Ilias und, 274-280

Word-Ends and Pauses in, 289-308

Homeric Papyri, Vulgate, 253-259

Problem, Chansons de Geste and, 193-233

Horace and Philodemus, 168-169

Carm. III, 4: Descende Caelo, 170-173

Pasquali's (rev.), 93

The Carmen Saeculare of, 324-329

The First Ode of, 73-76

Ibis, Rostagni's (rev.), 189

Ilias und Homer, Wilamowitz' (rev.), 274-280

Index Scoliodromicus, 370-382

INGERSOLL, J. W. D. The First Ode of Horace, 73-76

I. T.—Translator of Boethius, 266

Judas Curse, The, 234-252

KEIDEL, GEORGE C. Report of Romania, 267-271

Review of Dramatic Compositions Copyrighted in the United States, 1870 to 1916, 91-92

KELLOGG, GEORGE DWIGHT. Report of Philologus, 176-180

KENT, ROLAND G. Rev. of Sturtevant's Pronunciation of Latin and Greek, 183-185

Ker's Martial, Vol. II (rev.), 188

KEYES, CLINTON WALKER. Original Elements in Cicero's Ideal Constitution, 309-323

KIRK, W. H. *And* and *Or*, 1-11

KNIGHT, CLARA M. The Time-Meaning of the *To*-Participle in Vergil, 260-264

Latin Lexicography, Contributions to, 340-343
Pronunciation, 183-185
Pronunciation, Desultory Remarks on, 335-339
Writing, 285

Liebaert Collection of Photographs, 189

LINDSAY, W. M. Desultory Remarks on Latin Pronunciation, 335-339

Lindsay's List of Liebaert Photographs, 189

Lithuanian, Fluctuation between *o*- and *ä*-Stems in, 330-334

Livy VII. xiv. 6-10, 174-175

Lucretius, Ernout's (rev.), 93-94

Martial, Ker's (rev.), 189

Matriarchy in Germanic Hero-Lore, 286-287

MILLER, C. W. E. To Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, v
Notices:
Association Guillaume Budé's Publications, 94
Liebaert Collection of Photographs, 189
Review of Heidel's Anaximander's Book, 368-369

MUSTARD, W. P. Petrarch's Africa, 97-121
Reports:
Revue de Philologie, 83-84
Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica, 180-182, 271-273

Reviews:
Ernout's *Lucrèce, De la Nature*, 93-94
Haines's *Fronto*, Vol. II, 188
Ker's *Martial*, Vol. II, 188
Pasquali's *Orazio lirico*, 93
Rostagni's *Ibis*, 189
Stampini's *Studi di Letteratura e Filologia*, 188-189

Or, And and, 1-11
Original Elements in Cicero's Ideal Constitution, 309-323

Pais' *Fasti Triumphales Poluli Romani* (rev.), 92-93

Papyri, Vulgate Homeric, 253-259

Participle, Time-Meaning of, 260-264

Partizipium präteriti der germanischen starken Verben, Endung des, 12-24

Pasquali's *Orazio lirico* (rev.), 93
Paul's Epistles Compared with One Another and with the Epistle to the Hebrews, 58-72

PENICK, D. A. Paul's Epistles Compared with One Another and with the Epistle to the Hebrews, 58-72

PEPPLER, CHARLES W. Comic Terminations in Aristophanes, Part V, 152-161

Petersson's *Cicero* (rev.), 285-286

Petrarch's *Africa*, 97-121

Philodemus, Horace and, 168-169

Philologus, Report of, 176-180

Plato's Hedonism, 25-39

Pronunciation of Latin, 335-339
of Latin and Greek, 183-185

RAND, E. K. Rev. of Clark's *Collectanea Hispanica*, 354-362

Reports:
Glotta, 80-83
Hermes, 344-348
Philologus, 176-180
Revue de Philologie, 83-84
Rheinisches Museum, 348-353
Rivista di Filologia, 180-182, 271-273
Romania, 267-271

Reviews and Notices:
Aron's Matriarchy in Germanic Hero-Lore, 286-287
Association Guillaume Budé's Publications, 94
Bhagwaddatta's *Atharvavediyā Pañcapatalikā*, 362-368
Brown's *Stonyhurst Pageants*, 280-283
Butler's *The Sixth Book of the Aeneid*, 186
Clark's *Collectanea Hispanica*, 354-362

Coffey's Accidence of Hebrew Grammar, 88-90
 Collection des Universités de France, 93, 94
 Crump's The Growth of the Aeneid, 185-186
 Dramatic Compositions Copyrighted in the United States, 1870 to 1916, 91-92
 Ernout's *Lucrèce, De la Nature*, 93-94
 Fischl's Ergebnisse und Ausichten der Homeranalyse, 85-87
 Fowler's *Aeneas at the Site of Rome*, 186-187
 Haines's *Fronto*, Vol. II, 188
 Hasebroek's Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Septimius Severus, 284
 Heidel's *Anaximander's Book*, 368-369
 Ker's *Martial*, Vol. II, 188
 Lindsay's Liebaert Collection of Photographs, 189
 Pais' *Fasti Triumphales Poluli Romani*, 92-93
 Pasquali's *Orazio lirico*, 93
 Petersson's *Cicero: A Biography*, 285-286
 Rostagni, Ibis: *Storia di un poemetto greco*, 189
 Schiaparelli's *La Scrittura Latina nell' Età Romana*, 285
 Stampini's Studi di Letteratura e Filologia, 188-189
 Sturtevant's Pronunciation of Latin and Greek, 183-185
 Weege's *Etruskische Malerei*, 283-284
 Wilamowitz - Moellendorff's *Die Ilias und Homer*, 274-280
 Revue de Philologie, Report of, 83-84
 Rheinisches Museum, Report of, 348-353
 Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica, Report of, 180-182, 271-273
 Romania, Report of, 267-271
 Rostagni's Ibis (rev.), 189
 Schiaparelli's *La Scrittura Latina nell' Età Romana* (rev.), 285
 Scoliodromicus, Index, 370-382
 Septimius Severus, 284
 SHEPARD, W. P. *Chansons de Geste and the Homeric Problem*, 193-233
 SLAUGHTER, M. S. Rev. of Fowler's *Aeneas at the Site of Rome*, 186-187
 Sophocles *Philoctetes* 1360-61, 77-79
 Stampini's Studi di Letteratura e Filologia (rev.), 188-189
 STEELE, R. B. *Clitarchus*, 40-57
 Stonyhurst Pageants, 280-283
 STRICKLER, ROBERT PARVIN. Report of *Rheinisches Museum*, 348-353
 STURTEVANT, A. M. Die Endung des Partizipium präteriti der germanischen starken Verben, 12-24
 STURTEVANT, E. H. Word-Ends and Pauses in the Hexameter, 289-308
 Sturtevant's Pronunciation of Latin and Greek (rev.), 183-185
 TAYLOR, ARCHER. The *Judas Curse*, 234-252
 Time-Meaning of the To-Participle in Vergil, 260-264
 TUTTLE, EDWIN H. *Dravidian Notes*, 265
 Vergil, *Aeneid*, Growth of, 185-186
Aeneid VI, VIII, 185-186
 The Time-Meaning of the To-Participle in, 260-264
 Word-Ends and Pauses in the Hexameter, 289-308
 Vulgate Homeric Papyri, 253-259
 Vyāghramāri, or the Lady Tiger-Killer, 122-151
 Weege's *Etruskische Malerei* (rev.), 283-284
 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's *Die Ilias und Homer* (rev.), 274-280
 Word-Ends and Pauses in the Hexameter, 289-308
 WRIGHT, F. A. *Horace and Philodemus*, 168-169





An Economic History of Rome

TO THE END OF THE REPUBLIC

By TENNEY FRANK

Professor of Latin in the Johns Hopkins University

310 pp. Cloth, \$2.50.

As a study of the economic development of the city of Rome, the governing centre of the civilized world, it stands alone in its completeness, in the thorough use which the author has made of available evidence, in the sound judgment which he has shown, and in the clear, convincing way in which he has set forth his conclusions.

Professor FRANK FROST ABBOTT, in *The American Historical Review*.

Superior to anything in its field in any language.

Professor W. S. FERGUSON, in *American Economic Review*.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Baltimore, Maryland

Martial, The Epigrammatist

AND OTHER ESSAYS

By KIRBY FLOWER SMITH

Late Professor of Latin in the Johns Hopkins University

180 pp. Cloth, \$2.00.

Selections from Professor Smith's less technical papers, revised and edited by W. P. Mustard.

CONTENTS.

Martial, the Epigrammatist.....	1
The Poet Ovid.....	37
Propertius: a Modern Lover in the Augustan Age.....	75
Pupilia Duplex	101
The Classics and our Vernacular.....	117
The Future Place of the Humanities in Education.....	144
Some Boyhood Reminiscences of a Country Town.....	155
Original Verse and Translations.....	167

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS,

Baltimore, Maryland

THE
LIFE AND STORIES
OF THE
JAINA SAVIOR PĀRCVANĀTHA
BY
MAURICE BLOOMFIELD,
*Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in
The Johns Hopkins University*

266 Pages. Octavo. Cloth, \$3.00

Almost from the beginning of Hindu time the Brahmanical religion of India was subjected to criticism and renewed speculation on the part of Hindu thinkers of independent mind, resulting in much heterodox teaching and Sectarian activity. The religion of the Jainas is the older of the two great heretical Sects which grew up many centuries before Christ, the other being Buddhism. Unlike Buddhism the Jaina religion was not founded by a single great religious teacher, but reveres traditionally twenty-four Saviors (Arhats) which go back to an unthinkable antiquity. Only the last two of these have any kind of historical standing, and even they are known only by tradition founded upon more or less dubious chronicles. The older of these is Pārvanātha, said to have been born in 817 B. C. He seems indeed to have been an historical personage; at any rate he figures large in Jaina consciousness, and the doctrines ascribed to him are fundamental in Jaina religion.

The present work contains the fullest extant account of the Jaina Savior Pārvanātha's life, preceded by nine pre-births, all treated with the care of a chronicle of real life and with the sincerity of devout belief. With this life are interwoven a large number of stories illustrating Jaina morality and doctrine. The Jainas are, perhaps, the best story-tellers of India; the present volume adds to the chain of Hindu fiction books a jewel of no mean price. This work should arrest the attention of students of Comparative Literature and Folklore as well as students of the History of Religion.

Orders should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS,
Baltimore, Maryland,
U. S. A.

